National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XVIII. NO. 20. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1857. WHOLE NO. 904.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, 138 Nassau St., New York,

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

31 *North Fifth St., Philadelphia.*

RATE OF ADVERTISING, 10 cents per line each insertion.

NORRIS & JOHNSTON, PRINTERS.

Pro-Slavery.

STATEMENT OF COL. NETHERLAND.

From The Knoxville (Tenn.) Presbyterian Witness.

SOME weeks ago "A Statement" issued from your office, written by Samuel Sawyer. This statement was, as you say in your card, smuggled through your press, "through the *misrepresentations* and *fraud* of the author"; and you well denominate it, in your card, as "an infamous and shamefully exaggerated publication." Untrue as it is, in many of its material statements, I felt that I would let it go unnoticed by me, and leave the writer to be dealt with by the Church for falsehood; whether the Church authorities will do this or not remains to be seen.

I will briefly state the facts of this case, and then allude to the falsehoods of the writer and his suppression of the truth.

Some years ago I purchased of the Rev. F. A. Ross the negro in question. I kept him until his drunkenness, gambling and laziness caused me to sell him. He escaped from his owner, Mr. Blevins, in the fall of 1855.

I was absent from home most of the winter, during which time he was harboured and fed in the Female College at this place (without the knowledge of the gentleman in charge of it), day and night, by Anthony, a negro of mine that was hired at the College. There was a large number of young ladies in the College, who boarded and slept there, from our own and adjoining States. In the spring of 1856 the negro concealed himself in a den in the woods, in sight of our town, and remained there concealed, fed and supported by other negroes in and about the place, until June, 1856.

He had, shortly before I sold him, taken up with a free mulatto prostitute, by whom he had no children, and soon after he took the woods, she took up with another free negro, and was perhaps married to him; and after living together awhile, they concluded to go to Knoxville, but, before leaving, went into the country to stay a night with her grandmother. On returning to town next morning, they were waylaid by this negro, who was armed with a pistol and a large butcher-knife; he attacked them, snapped the cap of the pistol near the negro man's face, who ran to save his life; he followed him, and knocked him down with a stone, leaving him so disabled that he thought he could not get away. He then returned to the woman, and beat her over the head with the pistol, cutting her to the skull in several places; then he tied her down and committed a rape upon her, and, leaving her tied, went to finish the negro man, telling her that he would cut her throat as soon as he went and found his butcher-knife, which he had lost in the first attack; and further, that he intended to kill a negro man of mine, and another negro in the neighbourhood, and then *he* would be satisfied. The woman untied herself and escaped before his return, and the man, having recovered from the blow with the stone, also escaped, and both came to town.

Many citizens of the town turned out to arrest the villain, but he escaped. There was much excitement in the town and county. This negro was a terror to many, so that females in the neighbourhood were afraid to pass from house to house. He made his escape; and being watched for on the road by a white man with his rifle, was ordered to stop. He answered by presenting his pistol and swearing that he would kill the white man if he advanced on him. The white man drew his rifle and the negro ran and was shot, being hurt but slightly. He was pursued, and, again refusing to stop, was shot the second time, and yet made his escape, it being in the night. He then went to the next town, to the house of one of the most respectable ladies in the State, and was concealed in the cellar of her house, without her knowledge, for many months, in the town and near the street; the lady being in bad health and never going into the cellar, her servants were enabled to conceal him. His place of concealment was found, and he was taken and started to jail. On the way he cut himself loose with a knife which he had concealed about him, and, being in the custody of but one man, who was afraid to attack him thus armed, he escaped into the woods. He then came some forty miles from that place, into the neighbourhood of Rogersville, where he dug himself another den, within two miles of my house and in sight of one of my farms. He was discovered by two negro men, both of whom were in search of his hiding-place, and anxious to have him arrested on account of his outrageous character and crime, and they informed a white man, who, in company with another white man, went to his den and arrested him, and brought him to Rogersville, and delivered him to Mr. Blevins, who had been his owner since the fall of 1855.

The place of his concealment was known to my negro Anthony, who had before harboured him in the Female College for a whole winter, which he could easily do, without being even suspected by the gentleman in charge of the College.

Having made many fruitless searches for this desperate negro, and knowing that Anthony knew where he was, Mr. Blevins believed that he could induce Anthony to disclose Abe's place of concealment, by taking possession of him, and pretending to him that he had purchased him, and he would take him South in Abe's place, unless he told him where Abe was. I consented to this arrangement, and told Mr. Blevins further, that if he was obstinate and refused to tell, to whip and make him tell, but that I did not want him whipped too severely. Mr. Blevins, a few days before Abe's apprehension, during my absence from home at one of my courts, in pursuance of this agreement, took Anthony into possession, and endeavoured to induce him to tell where the other negro was. He refused to do so; was whipped at Bean's Station very severely; but still refused to tell. Mr. Blevins took him to jail, and the next morning, after receiving a few blows with a wooden slat, he told where the negro was, and there the negro was found, showing conclusively that our previous information was correct, and that he knew all about him.

When I returned home and found that the negro was taken, I wished to know by whom he had been harboured, as I determined that, so far as my example and efforts could prevent it, that negroes of desperate character should not be concealed in my neighbourhood or in a female school, among a hundred or more young ladies, as I know that no parent would permit his daughter to remain one hour in such a school, nor ought he to do it.

I said to Mr. Blevins, after we had tried to get from the negro his accomplices, and after he refused to give them, that he ought to punish him for his villanies, and to make him tell who had been harbouring him. Mr. Blevins said he would do so. I went home to my farm leaving the negro with Mr. Blevins; and, when he was whipped, I did not even know it, nor was I within three miles of the place, and had nothing to do with either the manner or the amount of the punishment, but I approve of it fully, and the truth is that the punishment he received was not equal in severity to 39 lashes with a cowhide; the object being to frighten more than to hurt him. There was not as much blood drawn from this negro as Sawyer has drawn from white boys that he has whipped since he came to Rogersville.

As soon as this took place, Sawyer commenced, in the town and country, to make false and exaggerated statements, and, becoming excited himself, seemed to believe everybody else was equally so. He drew up and presented resolutions before the Session, and prepared charges against me as a member of the Church. This was done in my absence, and without any notice to me or to any but one member of the Church. When the proceeding began before the Session, one of its members spoke of its irregularity, and remarked that if the Session wished to know my connection with the punishment of the negro, that, if I was called on, I would voluntarily give them the information. Sawyer objected to this, and now complains that it was the very thing I refused to do, and what he wished done. So the matter ended in the Session, so far as I have any information. I was on my way to a court over forty miles from home, where I remained more than a week, and before my return such was the feeling in the community that Sawyer had resigned as minister and said he would leave the country. After I had been at home several days, I was called on by Sawyer, who said he wanted to explain the matter to me; and told me that the resolution introduced by him in the Session had no reference to me, that he had not prepared or preferred any charge against me, and that he never had any intention of doing so. I recounted over to him several of his falsehoods, in relation to the matter, of which there is undoubted proof. The conversation closed by his saying that he would leave the country, that he would not trouble any one long. My answer was that he never would do any good in any place until he would have more regard for truth, and so we parted. The next thing I see from him is his "Statement to the Public," in which great lamentation is made over Anthony, who is, in the eye of Sawyer, worthy to have his virtues put on record by him and his brother Abolitionists. He represents him as having been my nurse, a member of the same Church with me, a gray-headed old servant, "dutiful and exemplary." Anthony has some notoriety in this region; he refused, without any cause, to live with his master who raised him from childhood; he was, at his own request, sold, and said, having once lived in a cotton region, he wanted to return to it; the owners of his wife and children bought him from the trader and kept him as long as his conduct would permit them, then sold him and his wife and children to a gentleman of this County; he run away from him, was taken and sold to another trader, who promised to take him out of the country, but sold him to another gentlemen in half a mile of the first seller. He kept him until his bad conduct forced him to sell him to another trader, who was bound by his contract to keep him confined until he left the country, and then take him three hundred miles before he would sell him, as the gentleman who had sold him to the second trader believed that he would burn some of his buildings. He was taken and put in jail, and, while there, procured a letter to be written to me to buy him.

I, as a matter of feeling, went to the owners and gave them my only reason for wishing to buy the negro, which was to gratify him, then went to the gentleman who had bound them to take him out of the county, and at my request he released them from that part of the contract, and I bought the negro out of the jail, being the seventh owner, six having before had him, four of whom sold him for his bad conduct. His first movement was to harbour and feed on stolen provision the villain Abe, for a whole winter, in a public school attended by the daughters of many of the best citizens of this and other States, many of whom boarded in the college, and stayed there day and night, and yet this is the negro that Sawyer says, in his Statement, is usually "dutiful and exemplary," and makes this infamously false statement with a full knowledge of his character.

I will do the negro the justice to say, that I regard him as a better man and more of a gentleman than Sawyer, and I consider that a poor compliment to the negro.

In this "Statement" of Sawyer, all the material facts have been suppressed. When the murder was attempted on the two negroes, and the rape committed on one, the fact was known to Sawyer, as was the general character of the negroes, and the fact of the harbouring the runaway by Anthony in the Female College, and yet these facts are suppressed by him.

The runaway is justified by him on the ground that many a white man would have killed another for a similar offence. This is the true abolition ground to put the negro on equal grounds with the white man, even to associate with their families and intermarry with their daughters. But in this case a white man would have been imprisoned in the penitentiary for the same offence, not less than ten years, and all would have approved his punishment, yet, when a negro of abandoned and desperate character receives a moderate punishment, these canting hypocrites raise a howl from one end of the Union to the other. Still, it is but a few years since we had a case reported in the papers of the day, and not contradicted, of the Abolition saints in Cincinnati burning a negro alive, in open day, in sight of hundreds, for the offence committed by Abe.

I will now specify some of the falsehoods of this publication:

1. It is untrue that the negro Abe was blindfolded and cruelly whipped.

2. It is untrue that a magistrate remarked that "if they undertook to whip the negro again, that they would not get through with it."

3. It is also untrue that my negro was whipped "on suspicion"—he was whipped on full proof of harbouring, and he did know and tell where the negro was concealed, and told the very place where he was found.

4. It is wickedly and wilfully false that the character of Anthony was "dutiful and exemplary," or that he was ever my nurse.

5. It is untrue that I ever refused to go before the Session, or was even requested to do so, or that my refusal distracted the Church, and nothing but the most shameless disregard of truth would have caused the statement.

6. It is infamously and knowingly false that I defended the whipping of the negroes on the "chattel ground," having never believed or advocated such a doctrine. Such is not the doctrine of the South any more than "Free Love" is that of the North. Nor did Dr. Carmichael ever advocate it, unless one of the most respectable ministers of the State is mistaken and unless the Doctor himself is mistaken as to what he said, and he had written, and held in his hand when he spoke.

7. "It is a delusion and a lie" when Sawyer seeks to make the impression that any such doctrine prevails in the South, but he no doubt can get a convenient Dr. to produce a false doctrine for him (as easily as Mrs. Cunningham was furnished with a false heir, by a Doctor equally convenient and accommodating, in New York.)

8. It is untrue that any brother-in-law of mine wrote any article in the papers advocating what Sawyer calls the "chattel ground." There are other falsehoods in this "Statement" equally easy to notice and refute, but let the above suffice.

Still, Sawyer goes to two Elders of the Church, writes a certificate for them, and procures their signatures, saying that "they concur in believing it to be a correct statement of the facts in the case, so far as they know." An amazingly convenient certificate—a tissue of lies from the beginning to the end; and yet these Elders are induced by Sawyer to endorse them, "so far as they know," and then, when a falsehood is pointed out, the answer is, I only certified "so far as I knew." In fact, they knew nothing and should have given no aid in circulating false statements against men who had done no wrong.

It is said, in this "Statement," that "members of the Methodist Church, and the Baptist Church, and the Old School Presbyterian Church, almost to a man, and the great mass of the community, stand with him on the facts of this case." I do not believe one word of this. I know that members of all these different Churches, and very many in this community, have charged Sawyer with lying for years, but he may *now* have his admirers.

It is a significant fact, in this connection, that when Sawyer wished to get a church, to preach in after his infamous conduct, he was unable after a strenuous effort, to procure one from either of these denominations, who he says "stand by him," they refusing even to give him that countenance.

The Abolitionists of the North take great pleasure in publishing portions of Sawyer's statement and sending me an occasional number of their paper, among them, the editor of *The Tribune*, a graceless scoundrel, who, if he had the opportunity, would sell his Saviour for less than Judas did. It may gratify them to know my treatment of negroes and what rights I claim over them as master. I have never whipped a grown negro in my life, though I have owned them ever since I owned property—yet I claim the right and will exercise it to make any negro of mine arrest a runaway of bad character, and I do not own one that would refuse to do it; and if any one of those Abolitionists wish to make my acquaintance, if they will come into my region of country and publish any of their inflammatory papers, calculated to excite our slaves—if any negro of mine, not even excepting Anthony, will refuse to cowhide him, he may take him to a free State.

I have not written this to satisfy Abolitionists, having a contempt for the whole of that class of fanatics, nor am I of the number that believe there are no men of candour and intelligence at the North; on the contrary, my opinion is that there are many men among them, who have proper information, who condemn and denounce these fanatics, and for such I have respect.

Yours respectfully, JNO. NETHERLAND.

DR. COX ON AGITATORS.

[In the *Genesee Evangelist*, the Rev. Dr. Cox is speaking of the Abolition Agitators in the New School Assembly, and thus speaks of the late Richmond Convention and its members.]

I AM not about to praise my brethren, who have been busy with this new quiddity at Richmond. The wisdom of *the man of Ross*, his metaphysics, his dialectics, and his tactics, may be none the wisest and the best. Even Dr. Newton, Dr. Boyd, Dr. Read, and other excellent brethren, may not be all just right, or as practically wise and calm and patient, as we could wish they were. But—a question remains! If they err, are we all innocent in the pre-disposing cause? Have we given them no occasion? Are their fears all ridiculous or gratuitous? Nay, have not we, and our *goadish* agitators, year after year continually, goaded them, pestered them, injured them, slandered them, wilfully dishonoured them, till they HAD TO DO SOMETHING—and possibly found not exactly the best thing and the wisest, after all. As said the venerable and excellent Dr. Hill—I heard him say it years ago, in the General Assembly, with tenderness and tears—"when we do come North to meet our brethren, they always set their dogs on us!" He is now in heaven.

However figurative was his rhetoric, it has a meaning. Some of our worst barkers have even been the men of rabid zeal canine, who forget that not zeal, but—WISDOM is profitable to direct. But then—*they* could not be the directors. Zeal and partisan nose-counts were with them about all of it. They forgot the Constitution, forgot the nature of the Kingdom of Christ, forgot the plain facts of Scripture and its teachings, forgot common sense—all for zeal and the Presidential election! And with how many this earthly fustian is better than the Gospel.

With them, as some of us *well* know, to talk of Scripture, or wisdom, or apostolic usage, especially when we are so cruel as to prove it, is to be an old fogy, a coward, a doomed "conservative," and an enemy to all proper reforms. If a man dares to think for himself he is sure to lose caste; to lose, impeached, suspected, villified—hence many, who might rather lead, only follow, like rotten wood afloat on the freshet, *whithersoever the governor listeth.* They acquiesce and conform for peace and popularity—while their sober convictions are coerced or crushed in the contest. Indeed, one often fears to be misrepresented, and fears it too much. The class to whom we refer as leaders and agitators, are not very scrupulous in their inferences and constructions. They, and what they think, are the only standard of rectitude with them. To differ from them is the demonstration of sin; the indictment, the evidence, the verdict, the sentence and almost its execution too. For example, by what rule do they slander a ministerial brother as pro-slavery, and call him such—with a view to render him infamous?—it seems that he dares—to think differently—that [illegible] really it seems to me. Well I know that [illegible] generally false, and only false. Yet [illegible] to run after the libel, and try to kill it, before it [illegible] breath and dies of itself? Some of us are better employed, and have too much of other and nobler work on hand. Yet, truth to say, the libellers are the liars in the matter—though very conscientious! *I verily thought that I ought, &c.*

Earnestness and zeal, if not governed by truth, becomes furious; and so much more mischievous than the evils they propose to exterminate. We may say that all mainly of the evil of this agitation has come of—EXTREME OPINIONS, EXTREMELY INTENSIFIED AND SENSITIVE ON BOTH SIDES of Mason and Dixon's line; I wish there was no such line!

Selections.

THE NEW HAVEN MEMORIALISTS IN REPLY TO THE PRESIDENT.

From The New Haven Daily Palladium, September 22, 1857.

To his Excellency, JAMES BUCHANAN, *President of the United States:*

IN July last, a number of citizens of Connecticut addressed to you, as Chief Magistrate of this nation, a memorial on the affairs of Kansas. To this you replied, under date of Aug. 15, 1857, in a manner which shows that you misunderstood, to some extent, the ground taken by the memorialists, for we would not impute to you the intention to misrepresent them. As you have thought proper to lay the memorial and reply before the public, a large part of the memorialists have conferred on the subject, and have felt themselves compelled again to address you. We would remark, then, that the main facts alleged in that memorial are either passed over without denial or are explicitly avowed in your reply.

These facts are two: First, "that the fundamental principle of the Constitution of the United States and of our political institutions is that the people shall make their own laws, and elect their own rulers." Secondly, "that Governor Walker of Kansas openly represents and proclaims that the President of the United States is employing, through him (Walker), an army, one purpose of which is to force the people of Kansas to obey laws which are not their own, nor of the United States; but laws which it is notorious, and established upon evidence, they never made and rulers they never elected." As to these two facts, the material facts alleged by your memorialists, and which chiefly require vindication from you, they say that they find no denial of them in your reply. They do not say that you have attempted no vindication of your acts and doings through Gov. Walker; but only that they can find in your reply no plain or explicit denial of the facts referred to—not even what they consider the shadow of a denial.

The facts stand in the Memorial, then, uncontradicted, by what you evidently consider a triumphant reply. Why is this? Are these assertions, on which the whole subject at issue depends, untrue—and yet no denial of them—not a word to prove them untrue? Without such denial, what can you expect your memorialists and the country to believe and to say? What, but that the facts which they allege are notorious and undeniable?

As to the allegation respecting the fundamental principle of the Constitution, your memorialists hope that the time is remote when the enlightened citizens of this country will deny that principle; though party zeal, in its infatuation, may one day trample it in the dust, when, in sight of the ruin, Liberty and Religion, in exile, will together weep over the desecration.

Your formal vindication next demands notice.

Of this, your memorialists are compelled to say that, in their view, it is entirely groundless and unsatisfactory.

Resting it solely on what you call "the plainest and most palpable historical facts," you say that, at the time of your inauguration, "you found, in fact, the government of Kansas as well established as that of any other Territory." You then ask, Was it not my duty to sustain this government—to prevent it from being overturned by force; in the language of the Constitution, "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed?" You then add: "It was for this purpose that I ordered a military force to Kansas, to act as a *posse comitatus* in aiding the civil magistrates to carry the law into execution." Here, then, is the distinct admission and declaration, on your part, that you ordered a military force to Kansas, for the purpose of sustaining its territorial government, and of enforcing its territorial laws. So far, then, in respect to one matter of fact, you admit the assertion of your memorialists.

Your vindication, therefore, rests upon the assertion that there was, in fact, a government in Kansas—such a government as it was your duty to sustain. The essential question on which the whole controversy turns is thus raised; it is simply this: Was there a government, or were there laws in Kansas, in a just, proper and authorized meaning of the language, "when you entered upon the duties of the Presidential office on the 4th of March last"?

If this can be proved to be true, your memorialists will know something which they have yet to learn. If it can be proved not to be true, "it will present a memorable example of the truth that political prejudice is blind even to the existence of the plainest and most palpable of historical facts." Nor is this all. It will show that you ordered an army to Kansas to sustain a so-called government which is not a government, and laws which are not laws.

Here your memorialists take the position that nothing can be truly government or law which has no authority; and that nothing should be treated as government or law which presents no evidence of authority.

Can anything which tramples under foot all human rights, and is a known outrage upon our Constitution and our political institutions, whatever be it its name or form, be justly regarded as government or law having authority under our Constitution? Can such an outrage be clothed with authority by a President, Senate, Congress, or a whole Congress of Presidents? Can usurpation beget a valid government or law, or impart that right to govern, which implies an obligation to obey? Its might may make it a matter of prudence to avoid its wrath by submission, but can usurpation create an obligation to obey when none exists?

Suppose the Great Mogul, or any other tyrant, had established the same so-called government and laws of Kansas, by the same means by which, as all the world knows, they were established—by invasion and arms; would any citizen of the United States call them "government and laws," except in derision and with loathing? Is a bogus government government? Are bogus laws laws? Is this "government established," and are these "laws enacted," and yet known to possess no other or higher authority than that derived from border ruffians! Are "We, the people of the United States," to be stultified into the belief of such a dogma! For that result, wait at least for the more absolute dominion of a tyrant.

Your memorialists will now present what they consider the fundamental error of your reply. In their view, in recognising the territorial government and laws of Kansas as a genuine government and valid laws, you have perverted the general principle upon which you rest your vindication, and have violated its essential spirit and meaning.

That general principle may be thus stated: When rules of action, claiming to be valid laws, present on the first aspect evidence that they proceed from a rightful law-making power, it is the duty of the people and executors of law to recognise them as authoritative. To this, as a general principle, your memorialists subscribe. It is the only means of giving practical authority to law, and of preventing violence and anarchy. Nor do they yield to any man or class of men a higher estimate of its importance, or a firmer determination to adopt and defend it, than themselves. But to say that all governments and all laws claiming to be valid must be recognised, executed and obeyed as such, is as preposterous as to deny the general principle itself. To mistake the general rule for an universal rule, the conditional for an unconditional principle, must lead to false reasoning and to practical conclusions of the most dangerous character. This, in the view of your memorialists, who believe that none are too wise or good to err, is what you (they trust inadvertently) have done.

In recognising the territorial government and laws as authoritative, have you not violated the whole spirit and meaning of the general principle laid down? Have you not wholly disregarded the essential condition, that the only government which it is your duty to sanction must present some evidence of rightful authority? You recognise the territorial laws as valid. What is this but to act upon the principle that, when the so-called government and laws come before you, without the shadow of evidence of their proceeding from a rightful law-making power, but with the most decisive and overwhelming proof that they have originated in a palpable and violent usurpation, that even then, even in a case so flagrant, it is your duty to sustain and execute them, even by the armies of the United States?

Your memorialists are here anxious to call your attention to an important distinction, which you appear entirely to overlook. They readily concede that, in cases of no unfrequent occurrence, one government may properly recognise another as authoritative, or as a government *de facto*, on a very low degree of evidence, without rigidly investigating its authority, or even considering its origin. For example, the government of Great Britain, when Louis Napoleon was enthroned in France by the [illegible] of the empire and with the acquiescence and consent of the people, had no right to interfere with a government thus "established." The British, as a foreign government, had no right of question or of control in the matter. But does it follow, because the government of Great Britain had no right to interfere with what was an undeniable usurpation in a foreign kingdom, that the government of the United States had no right, and were not bound to interpose, and put down, in one of their own Territories, a ruffian usurpation from Missouri?

In respect to France, there was reason enough why other nations, for purposes of *national* intercourse, should recognise its present government as an "established government." But is not the Constitution of the United States the supreme law of the land? Has not our Government the right to authorize and regulate the Government of its own territories? Can Congress or the President abandon this right, or the duty which arises from it? If this Government owes any duty whatever to the country, is it not most sacredly bound to protect both State and Territory against the imposition of a government and laws by a ruffian and violent invasion from another State? Your memorialists, then, strenuously insist that the only principle on which recognition can ever be justified is, that there is some evidence, be it more or less, that the government proceeds from an authorized law-making power. And they further insist, that when such government is within our own borders, under the supervision and control of the Federal Government and claiming to derive all its sanction from a law of Congress, the evidence of its authority must be clear and decisive. But how is it when there is no such evidence? How is it when all the evidence is strong against its authority? How is it when there is the best evidence the case admits of, even decisive, unquestionable proof, that the so-called government has no other authority than ruffianism and outrage? Is such a "government" to be practically recognised, and that, too, within the limits of our own republic? There surely may be cases in which it would be a gross wrong to sustain a territorial government which has no authority. And now, we ask, what government could you refuse to sustain, if not one that had its origin solely in a violent invasion of ruffians from another State? This fact, in the present case, can be denied; so can God, when his sun shineth in the heavens.

This usurped government cannot be sanctioned by the law of Congress authorizing the formation of a territorial government. That law declares that "the true intent and meaning of this act is to leave the people (of the Territory) perfectly free to regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." To the people, and them alone, it expressly gives the right to make their own government and laws. Here is no sanction, no authority, for a government not framed by the people, but founded solely on invasion. Can this law enthrone in rightful sovereignty bandits from a neighbouring State? As well say that it authorized them to seize every acre of Kansas for their own use and behoof. It can as well deprive the people of one right as of another, of all rights, as of one. Is it said "that Congress authorized the establishment of a government?" Yes; but by the people, not by marauders. Is it further said "that we must adhere to a general principle?" What principle? Why, as your whole argument implies—that a government "established" is a government to be recognised. We deny such a government in Kansas. Beware how you stretch a general principle, and make it universal. Though one may safely pass the Niagara river at all other points and places, none but a madman would attempt the passage on the verge of the cataract!

Your memorialists urge, therefore, that the so-called Government of Kansas can claim no sanction from the act of Congress. The evidence was all against it; evidence known to the whole civilized world, apparent on the very face of the transaction, and which must have challenged your attention long before you had taken the oath of office. The very fact, that the so-called Government required support from the Federal Executive, was the strongest evidence that it did not come from the people and had no lawful authority. This shows, at once, that this Government was not, in the lowest sense, what you call an "established government"; for it shows that it was not and could not be established without a United States army; and therefore the army was sent, not, as you pretend, to *sustain* an "established government," but for the purpose of *establishing* what was not established—a government of ruffian authority.

Nor could you have been ignorant that the House of Representatives had sent a special Committee of Investigation to the Territory, and thus acknowledged and confirmed the propriety of a strict inquiry *into this very case.* On the report of that committee, the House of Representatives authoritatively declared that the Government of Kansas was established by the terror of bowie-knives and revolvers, and that it had been proved to have not a shadow of authority. And here your memorialists ask whether a plainer case or stronger evidence can well be imagined? When, if not in such a case, ought the President to denounce a government as spurious, and to refuse to aid or sustain it? The laws of Congress trampled in the dust—the invaders from Missouri proved, beyond a cavil, to be the only authors of this "government"—is it not an outrageous wrong to hold Kansas subject to such usurpation by a United States army? The fires of ruffianism still burn there, smothered in the dreariness of their own desolation, and ready to be rekindled in their fury by the slightest movement for liberty and right on the part of the people; while the echo of their sufferings ever rings in the ears of our national Executive.

Let it be remembered that this Government comes to the people of Kansas, not with the sanction of gray antiquity; nor has it yet come from any law of Congress, as its true and proper source; nor yet from the people of the Territory; nor yet from being even fully established. It is of recent origin and formation. It dates only from the imposition of it by the ruffians from Missouri, upon the people who abhor and disown it. Every man who has, from the first, known its existence, has known its origin and its nature. Let it then be taken as it is; as it is, in its origin and its nature. And what is it? A code of laws oppressive, unjust, cruel, outrageous without parallel, created, imposed, by the usurpation of ruffians from Missouri. And these laws, and this "government," without the least evidence to establish their authority, but with the most abundant proofs to the contrary, you are proposing to sustain and execute by the United States army! You speak of "numbers of lawless men, &c.," alluding evidently to the Topeka Constitution. Be it so, for the sake of the argument; but how does one "lawless attempt" to establish a government, justify or palliate another lawless attempt for the same purpose?

Further: In your reply, you seem to your memorialists to concede, in all its truth and force, the principle which they maintain. Thus you unequivocally and justly assert that "for a portion of the people of Connecticut to undertake to establish a separate government, within its chartered limits for the purpose of redressing any grievance real or imaginary," would be usurpation, and add that "such a principle, carried into execution, would destroy all lawful authority, and produce universal anarchy." Your memorialists fully subscribe to this doctrine. But what is the act which you call usurpation in the case supposed? What is it but setting up a government claiming authority, and laws demanding execution, which, in the nature of the case, can claim no authority and are opposed to existing authority? If you would call this "usurpation" in Connecticut, if it would "destroy all legal authority and produce universal anarchy," what is this but the very act which Missouri invaders have perpetrated in Kansas? There was government in Kansas; government under the Constitution of the United States. Law was there also, a law for the organization of government by the people of the Territory. Right too was there, the inviolable right of the people to make their own laws and elect their own rulers. In opposition to that existing government, in violation of that existing law; trampling upon those inherent rights, Missouri invaders have set up a bloody tyranny, which has in fact produced anarchy and bloodshed. If you condemn the one, condemn the other also. Your memorialists have nothing to ask of you in this matter, but consistency of principle. Condemn the same conduct in both cases; put down the usurpation in Kansas, and the friends of truth, of justice, and of the country, would rejoice.

Your memorialists again ask, whether a case can well be imagined, to which the name of authoritative government could be applied with more palpable impropriety and untruth, than to the Territorial Government of Kansas? Might not even political shamelessness blush to call it by such a name? Was not the true and only character of this Government known to you and the whole country before your inauguration, and during the Presidential canvass? Did you not, with the full knowledge of it, accept your nomination, which you were free to decline, and thus avoid the responsibility of executing these nefarious laws; or, did you suppose that the oath of office would exempt you from this responsibility? You admit the Constitutional duty of the President to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." And now, without holding you responsible for any acts of your predecessor, for which you are not willing to be responsible and have not fully sanctioned, your memorialists would ask, was there no law to be taken care of, by preventing a well-known projected invasion of the political rights of the people of Kansas; no law to be taken care of afterward by expelling the invaders from the Territory—no law to be taken care of in respect to [illegible], the robberies, the incendiarism and the murders that were perpetrated—no law to be taken care of in the mode of civil administration adopted by Federal officials—no law to be taken care of in not appointing officials whose hands were red with innocent blood, or in removing bribed and perjured judges—no law to be taken care of by securing to the people of the Territory that fundamental right of the Constitution—a right guarded by an express law of Congress—the right "to make their own laws and elect their own rulers"—no law to be taken care of in giving to Congress information at least of the state of the Union, and especially in recommending necessary and expedient measures for the relief of the people of Kansas from the injustice, the oppression and the barbaritics to which they were subjected? Had then Great Britain any such laws to take care of in France, when the present Emperor was entbroned there by usurpation, as those which our Government—our President—was bound to take care of in our own Territory? In utter neglect of these laws, have you not, with a full knowledge of the nature of this usurpation, its origin, its progress, its violation of the Constitution and of fundamental rights, its violence, its rapine, its massacres, its conflagration, and its shame, sustained at every step its authors and abettors to this hour? Have you not sanctioned such conduct by placing, or retaining, prominent leaders therein in official stations?

Again: Are the troubles and calamitics of Kansas the legitimate results of the wise administration—of the true and right-working, in such an exigency—of our National Government?—the most perfect specimen of Government the world has seen—to our own admiration, the perfection of excellence. Surely, such results bespeak some derangement, some disturbing force in the evolutions of a machinery so fitted to do good, so powerful to its high design.

But if your example in administration, and that of your predecessor in office, are to be followed in future, whenever similar cases shall occur; if every usurpation of power, when it has gained a temporary success, is thenceforth to be backed by the whole power of the Federal Government, and forced upon the indignant people on whom, by fraud or violence, it had imposed itself, where will the end be? How often will such crises actually occur, resulting from the very nature of our Government, with such a principle in its administration to originate and foster them? What a temptation to party spirit, thus unrestrained, emboldened, upheld by the Government of the nation, would be furnished to carry out its schemes and its triumphs in violence and bloodshed? What shall hinder? Let the administration of the Government change hands—and such changes may be frequent—how surely would the same contests be reënacted by way of reprisals for past injuries and oppressions? How would such contests be repeated in Territories and in States till, to your own mind, would be revealed in the very principle which you assume, a weakness in our Government foretelling its speedy dissolution.

Of the particular considerations by which you have endeavoured to support the fundamental principle of your reply, the first which demands notice is, that "when you entered upon your official duties, Congress had recognised the Legislature (of Kansas) in different forms and by different enactments." Had you informed your memorialists what these "different enactments" were, they might have been made the subject of distinct examination. As it is, they can only say that they know of no "forms or enactments" of Congress which could be binding on you as authoritative, or which you had reason even to regard as evidence of the validity of that Legislature. Did you refer to the act by which the usual appropriations from the treasury were made? Every one knows in what manner and for what reason that act was passed, and that many who voted for it regarded, and still regard, the Territorial Legislature as downright usurpation; nor had they any suspicion that they were recognising its validity. How this bill can invest an act of usurpation with authority, your memorialists are unable to discover. What if the Legislature of Connecticut had, under the excitement of party strife, even by a formal act, recognised the usurpation which you have supposed; might not the Governor justly fall back upon his own official prerogative, call out the militia, and suppress the rebellion? If he would be bound to recognise such an usurpation as government having authority, when could he ever suppress it without himself becoming a rebel against the very authority which he recognises? Apply this illustration to the President of the United States, and you will see, that the fundamental principle of all your reasoning is absolutely suicidal, and thus renders nugatory your entire vindication. Did not President Jackson, on his own official responsibility as National Executive, set at defiance alike the power and authority of a "sovereign State?" And can a Territorial Government rank with an independent State Sovereignty! Can border-ruffianism, by any act of Congress, become entitled to respect and support, as a rightful law-making power, from the President of the United States? The case is too flagrant. The facts are too notorious. No truly independent, self-relying President, who understood his official prerogative, and his duty under the Constitution, would have hesitated to disregard even a direct act of Congress so tyrannical and oppressive, and appeal to his country and the world for his vindication.

But no such trying emergency was here presented. With the solemn decision of the House of Representatives, after long investigation, that the Legislature of Kansas had no authority, and that its laws were no laws, with that direct, positive and unimpeachable evidence before you, your memorialists cannot but express their surprise that you have relied upon your construction of indirect, inconclusive acts of that same body, as evidence of the authority of that Legislature. They know of no rule of law by which you can set up constructive, inferential evidence against direct and positive evidence from the same source. But this proof you pass over in utter silence?

Alluding to the condition of the Territory, you speak of the course which you adopted, as "absolutely necessary;" and ask, whether "you would not have been justly condemned, had you left," what you assume to be the Government and its administration "impotent," and thus have suffered it to become an "object of contempt in the eyes of the people." Our first reply to this view of the case, is, as before, there was no (Territorial) Government in Kansas to be executed, as you suppose. And again, we say the usurped government ought to have been rendered impotent, and to have become an object of contempt, in the eyes of the people, as it has become. But further, Congress has passed a law for the establishment of a government in this Territory, with this formal and positive explanation, that the people (in the Territory) be left perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way. Why then could not a Governor of Kansas have been appointed at any time, acting under your authority, and with an army under his control, who would have suppressed all internal violence and contention, and "left the people free to form and regulate their domestic institutions, &c.," as well as employ an army to act the absurd and farcical part of a *Posse Comitatus*, to enforce, under your direction, territorial laws which had no pretence of authority? Without saying who were, or who were not, the responsible originators of the troubles in Kansas, can it be doubted that the President long before this time, by the course now suggested, or some other, might have put an end to these troubles? Has he not the power to "take care that the laws"—and, of course, that the law of Congress respecting Kansas—"be faithfully executed."

You have introduced several topics into your reply—as that of slavery, the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Dred Scott, with others—on which your memorialists have said nothing in their memorial, and on which they intend to say nothing now, except to express their dissent from your opinions.

It is needless to prolong this discussion. Your whole vindication, if it has any ground, rests, in the view of your memorialists, upon one palpably false assumption: That whatever claims to be a government *de facto*, without a pretence of its proceeding from any rightful law-making power, is entitled to your support. The world has not seen a usurpation which this principle would not sanction. If adopted in the administration of our Government, it must involve, sooner or later, its destruction.

Pardon, now, if need be, the plain and respectful earnestness of your memorialists in unfolding what they consider false principles in your positions on the present subject. They speak of no want of honesty in your opinions, nor of sincerity in your avowal of them—of no want of patriotism on your part, nor yet of that higher principle which God approves. They speak only of what they consider error in your reasonings, and of its consequences in political evils. They judge not the heart. They have not imputed to you any violation of your oath of office, as you have thought fit to charge. Their language shows the contrary. They said, "by the foregoing you are held up—as violating, &c." The "foregoing" here spoken of, is shown by the connection to be the claim of Governor Walker, that "the President of the United States is employing through him (Walker) an army, one purpose of which is to force the people of Kansas to obey laws not their own nor of the United States; but laws which it is notorious, and established upon evidence, they never made, and rulers they never elected." This claim of Gov. Walker, if admitted by you in its full extent, and admitted on the ground of making the general principle mentioned above a universal one—thus applying a mere rule of international law to the international Government of this country—would in our view involve the most serious imputations upon any Chief Magistrate. But you had not at that time, so far as we are aware, given any public sanction to that claim, and the memorial therefore did not contain the imputation you supposed.

The memorialists have dwelt on the error referred to above, as they regard it, not merely on account of its fatal tendency and the calamities which have actually resulted from it, but, also, because they are confident that you, in common with many of your honest fellow-citizens, have overlooked one essential principle, in assuming that the ruffian usurpation in Kansas is "an established government." Be assured that they intend to withhold no tribute due to their intellectual eminence or moral character. They believe, however, that many errors and misconceptions are compatible with the highest mental culture and intellectual ability.

Your memorialists have spoken earnestly, because they deeply deplore the adoption of a principle which leads to the mal-administration of so perfect a system of Government as that which our fathers, by their wisdom, their prayers and their blood, have given to their posterity. They cannot believe in the unapproachable infallibility of their rulers under this system of true liberty; and while they would honour them in the fear of God, they are confident that neither they nor even "kings have the right divine to govern wrong." They hope for the continuance of our National Government, and for its wise and effective administration, in guarding the privileges and bless

is no hope of rescue, but in the united mass of Democratic Republicans.

It is darkest just before dawn. This is the darkest our of the night. Never before has a doctrine been proclaimed, which not only no European nation, but no nation of Christendom, save only Brazil and our own, would now maintain. The disgrace has fallen upon us through our supineness and our divisions. Let us be supine no longer, and let us lay aside all minor divisions, that we may redeem our country, the country of our freedom-loving forefathers, from that curse, greater than slavery—that of loving, praising and extending it.

The condition of Kansas demands your most attentive consideration. You see there the fruits of that policy of which the present National Administration is the defender and promoter—a country opened to slavery that slavery might be sure to enter; a Legislature chosen by slaveholders, who did not live on the soil; and making laws which no freeman could bear; this Legislature and these laws upheld by the President and Congress; and the President now enforcing them, because he says he has no dispensing power. But how does it happen that this Legislature and these laws exist? Who are responsible for them? Who called them into being? The party which now has control of the General Government; the party against which we contend; the party which seeks to carry the State of New York at the coming election; and which would be emboldened to reopen the slave trade, if it should succeed in bearing down the Democratic Republicans.

When we say this, we have said enough to satisfy every friend of freedom, and every lover of good government, that our success now is scarcely less important than it was at the last Presidential election. If we can hope ever to retrieve the losses which freedom has sustained, and is constantly sustaining, we must stand firm now, and show the State of New-York as the irremovable bulwark against the slaveholders' domination.

Citizens of the State of New York, fellow-electors, the choice is before you. You are to determine whether the State shall be governed by a party calling itself Democratic, which believes in the inequality of men and the right of one to buy and sell another, and which, in that part of the State now under its control, presents the worst instance of misgovernment which this country ever beheld; or by the Democratic Republicans, who believe in the equality of men before the law; in the inalienable rights of every human being; in a simple but firm government; in the economical administration of affairs; and who will strive to secure the purity of the elective franchise and the purity of legislation.

RESOLUTIONS.

Resolved, That the Democratic Republican party of the State of New York adhere with inflexible firmness to the doctrines of the founders of the Republic; that the true end of government is the maintenance of human rights, and the test of a just administration the extent to which it carries that doctrine into practice.

Resolved, That it is a contradiction of terms to call that man a Democrat who believes in the right of one man to enslave another; or to designate that a Democratic Government which carries slavery wherever it goes.

Resolved, That the opinions of the majority of the Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Dred Scott, and the letter of the President to the memorial of clergymen on the affairs of Kansas, contain doctrines to which the people of this State will never assent, be the consequences what they may.

THE PIOUS SLAVE-TORTURER, OF ROGERSVILLE.

From The Tribune.

Deacon-Colonel John Netherland of Tennessee, who figured more conspicuously than creditably in the flagellatory events which have given so much fame to the before obscure town of Rogersville, in that State, has published a long statement of the affair, in which the fact most conspicuously apparent is that Col. John Netherland is in a very bad humour. He permits his angry passions to rise to the height of calling us "a graceless scoundrel who, if he had the opportunity, would sell his Saviour for less than Judas did." Not being a man-stealing deacon or a baby-vending Church-member, we do not know what wickedness we might be betrayed into; but if Netherland will only promise *not* to pray for us, we hope to escape any crying iniquity. And if the Great Teacher to whom Netherland so irreverently alludes should again appear in the flesh, we think that he would be much safer from sale or even from scourging in New York than in Rogersville.

The knob of Netherland's statement is that the Rev. Samuel Sawyer is a liar. We have a succession of point-blank contradictions. For instance, the boy Abe was not flogged at all severely, his blows, in the opinion of Deacon John, being absolutely affectionate caresses in comparison with those which should have been administered. Now we must tell Netherland very plainly that we do not believe him and we do believe Sawyer, not as the Deacon may think because we are prejudiced, but simply because it is not reasonable to suppose that a clergyman who had been comfortably settled for a period of years over a Church, and who must have known that falsehood would have been followed by instant exposure, would gratuitously have gone to work and invented such a tale. The presumptions are all the other way. He would be more likely instead of exaggerating to extenuate the cruelties. He was writing of events of which all his neighbours were cognizant, and must indeed have been mad to have devised a roorback which so many people were in a position to refute. Then, on the other hand, Netherland says distinctly that he was not present either at the Abe or the Anthony flogging, so that by his own showing he is not a competent witness. But by his own confession it appears that he did deliver up his own slave to be tortured by bruiser Blevins, and that he did incite that merchant of men to chastise Abe.

The Deacon justifies the flogging by saying that Abe ran away, that he was a bad boy, that he was intemperate, that he was this, that and the other. What seems to have been his great crime—greater in the opinion of Netherland than even the rape which this Abe is charged with committing upon the person of his own wife—is, that once having run away, he refused to come back again. He even had the audacity to take shelter in a female college. So successful was he in evading pursuit that for about two years all search for him was vain. Now we do not know that it makes any difference as to the propriety or impropriety of torturing a man whether he be sober or drunken, smart or lazy, chaste or incontinent. Admitting this slave to have been as bad as possible—and we certainly should not expect to find all the virtues in a chattel—we must say that the fact is more discreditable to his former master, the Rev. Dr. Ross, than to the boy himself. That eminent divine should have given him a better training. But, after all, is Abe the monster which he is represented to be by Netherland? We have only the Deacon's word for it. On the other hand, we find that for a long time this depraved wretch was fed, sheltered and concealed by the neighbours, white and black, which affords pretty good evidence that he was popular among them. The Deacon avers that he sold Abe to Blevins because his character was bad. Bad for what? For being sullen under the lash? Abe cannot speak for himself, and we certainly shall not take Netherland's word as to his character.

Concerning the flogging administered to Anthony, for refusing to disclose Abe's place of concealment, we have the distinct admission of Netherland himself that he did surrender Anthony to Blevins, the slave-trader, in order that the secret of Abe's concealment might be flogged out of him. He also adds that Anthony was flogged at Bean's Station "very severely." These are Netherland's own words. He admits that Anthony received two distinct floggings, one at the station and the other at the jail. This coincides with Sawyer's statement. Indeed, the general effect of Netherland's letter is to strengthen our belief in the truth of all that was important in the first narration. We have the fact of both floggings admitted, and also the fact that Netherland assented to the one and avised the other. One of these castigations, he says, was "very severe," and we have the testimony of eye-witnesses to the cruelty of the second.

Moreover, if Netherland's manifesto did not contain these admissions, we find enough in it, upon his own showing, to impeach his character for truth and veracity. In the following sentence he admits that he assisted in the invention of a lie, and instigated and encouraged another to utter it:

"Having made many fruitless searches for this desperate negro, and knowing that Anthony knew where he was, Mr. Blevins believed that he could induce Anthony to disclose Abe's place of concealment, by taking possession of him, and pretending to him that he had purchased him, and he would take him south in Abe's place unless he told him where Abe was. I consented to this arrangement."

And a very pretty "arrangement" it was for a Deacon of the Presbyterian Church to enter into. *The Journal of Commerce* yesterday gave Netherland a very thick coat of the purest orthodox whitewash. What do the immaculate conductors of that saintly sheet think of a Deacon who enters into an "arrangement" with a trader in negroes, to tell lies to a simple old man to induce him to betray the confidence which has been reposed in him? This little confession settles Netherland in our estimation. We should not feel obliged to believe him although he made oath to the truth of his narrative.

In paying his personal compliments to *The Tribune*, near the close of his production, the Deacon says: "I have never whipped a grown negro in my life, though I have owned them ever since I owned property." Pray is it the custom of Southern gentlemen to do their own flogging? We thought that it was rather the practice to keep a skilful professional flogger in pay, or to detail one or two of the stoutest slaves for the purpose, so that the Deacon's brag that he never whipped *a grown* negro in his life does not, after all, seem to amount to much. He hires it done. He deputes wandering slave-traders to do it, as upon this occasion. He only exercises himself now and then upon the picaninnies.

The Tract Society.—Some of the ultra pro-slavery papers at the South are by no means soothed by the recent movement of the American Tract Society, in regard to the publication of tracts upon slavery. *The* (Richmond) *South* professes to treat it as a mere trick to "coax the South out of its sulky humour," and hopes the overtures will be rejected.—*Daily Times.*

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1857.

BOANERGES BROWNLOW.

We shall not ask our courteous readers to cast their eyes over the letter of the Rev. W. G. Brownlow, editor of the *Knoxville Whig*, better known perhaps as the Fighting Parson, which he has done us the honour to address to us—for we know them too well to believe that they could help themselves if they tried. They would not be worthy of the vocation wherewith they are called to be the readers of so excellent a paper as The Standard, if their healthy appetites did not at once instinctively urge them to so savoury a morsel as this which we serve up to them to-day. We commend particularly to their notice the high character given to our modest sheet by this discriminating and most competent critic at the opening of his epistle, as we are confident that if anything could increase their regard and esteem for it, it would be the sense which our Reverend contemporary has of its wants. It is precisely the praise which it has always been our ambition to have in the mouths of all slaveholding Churches and ministers, and we shall account it another of the many seals which authenticate the genuineness of our apostleship. We trust that we are not accustomed to think more highly of ourselves than we ought to think; but if anything could throw us off our balance, it would be such a testimony to the excellence of the work we have turned out as so competent a witness—an "expert," as it is called in law—here bears in pronouncing it "the most *infinitely infernal* production" he ever saw, and in attributing its origin to the dominions of darkness, and its fellowship to the Devil and his angels.

Our Reverend Correspondent will also be pleased to accept our congratulations on the diligence with which he hath given himself to the study of the doctrine, and the improvements thereupon, which he found in the number of The Standard which has extorted from him this cordial commendation of the temper, spirit and thoroughness with which we have delivered the gospel committed unto us. He has "perused the paper through, editorials, selections and contributions," and we will venture to say that he never had a more edifying lecture in his life. We fear not to affirm that he has not seen so much truth in the same space since he was called to the ministry of saving souls and torturing bodies in Tennessee. For it was this Christian minister, some of our readers may be aware, who lately said that, if he could have had his way, a certain slave, who was burned in his neighbourhood by Lynch law, should have been torn limb from limb alive, and his flesh torn off with red-hot pincers. This was in a recent letter from our Reverend Epistler to the *Daily Times* of this city, *apropos* to some strictures on the little eccentricity of Col. Netherland towards his negro which was the occasion of this letter to us. We should judge from this taste of his quality, thus furnished by himself, that he is entirely competent to pass without appeal on the infernal nature of any productions whatsoever, and also to speak as one having authority of the dominions of darkness and of the fellowship of the Devil and his angels. We may possibly doubt his accuracy in regard to our own genesis, but there can be no question, after this, as to his general competency as a witness in regard to such matters.

We have not room to go into any extended *exegesis* on this Epistle. We would merely draw the attention of Northern Christians, and especially those of the Methodist order, to the pattern of Christianity, good manners and the English language, that they will find written down therein. This is the sort of Christian minister, scholar and gentleman that slavery makes out of material, which, it is barely possible, might have been worked up into a divine of the fair Northern average, had he been placed in favourable surroundings. He might have been educated up to the level of common humanity, of an ordinary comprehension of the canons of Biblical interpretation, and even to a grammatical use of the English tongue. We admit that it requires a good deal more faith than a grain of mustard-seed to perceive the possibility of such very violent improbabilities; but we Abolitionists are eminently a believing generation, in spite of all our enemies say of our infidelity, and we can swallow almost anything that is unlikely. His example should have the effect of making all Northern ministers, who know a cruel action when they see it, who have been taught how to extract wisdom and purity out of the Scriptures instead of drivelling blasphemy against God and Man, and who can write English such as a school-boy need not be ashamed of, grateful for the mercy which has cast their lines in latitudes farther from the Equator. They might have been even as this clerical bruiser, coarse, brutal, and illiterate, had they been born in those barbarous regions where the Gospel of Slavery is preached by such Apostles as this.

But the Rev. Editor, it seems, is resolved to be even with us. Manifold as have been the offences of the North and of the Abolitionists in particular, our punishment is at hand, and, if inevitable, we fear may be greater than we can bear. Our readers, we are sure, will read with horror and amazement the doom which this implacable Inquisitor proposes to visit upon us for our sins. He is preparing to come down on us, like a wolf in the fold, clad in four times quadruple mail. A minister with only five or six heads to his discourse is generally regarded with terror, in these days of small things and short sermons, and the trembling hearer hopes in his secret soul that the next division may be announced as "lastly" or "to conclude." What wide-spread consternation, then, must a Reverend divine scatter throughout a country, who approaches the people with a Discourse with Sixteen Heads? A very Hydra of a Homily! What Hercules have we equal to this adventure? And eight hours long! We shudder at the bare idea—and dread to think what treachery we might be tempted to be guilty of towards the slave, if duty to him compelled us to incur this horror. It was fair and above-board, we allow, on his part, to give us fair warning of what we have to expect. We may, if our hearts should still fail us, fly away and hide ourselves, as men did before the face of William Gilmore Simms, LL. D., when he threatened last winter to overwhelm them with the mountain weight of his stupidities.

There is one thing very noteworthy about this projected missionary visit of our pro-slavery propagandist, and that is, that he has no doubt of civil treatment and a fair chance of being heard. And, of course, he will get both. Nobody will think of getting up mobs to drive him away or to put him down. If he can persuade people to go and hear him after the ample notice he has given them of what they are to expect, he will have no interruption or disturbance. He is entirely free to persuade the labouring people of the free States that the negroes are much better off than they, and that they had better subside into the happy condition of careless chattelism without delay. He may convince our capitalists and landholders, if he can, that it would be much better for them to adopt that system of labour which has so much increased the value of land in the slave States over what it can reach in the free. He may overturn our institutions, if he have the skill, and have never a coat of tar and feathers offered for his wearing or an extemporized halter thrown over a branch for his repose. But how is it with his own vicinage? He is very ready, he says, to meet Mr. Theodore Parker or Mr. Ward Beecher in debate. But can those gentlemen go to Knoxville to hold it? Can any of the "*pious rascals*" or "*vagabond philanthropists*" whom he thirsts to meet in single combat at the North, go towards the South to pick up his gauntlet, and hold the tournament there, and have safe-conduct to go and come? Of course, our ordained Champion would be one of the first to do them to death. And why, if slavery be indeed an institution ordained of God at the very foundation of the world, and blest by him ever since, can it be endangered by the assaults of such enemies? Is the arm of God shortened that he cannot protect his own? This simple fact is a two-edged sword to smite off all the sixteen heads of the monster he proposes to set upon us to devour us.

We do not believe that either Mr. Parker or Mr. Beecher will meet this doughty Son of Thunder in the field of debate. To do so, would be to admit that he had an inch of ground to stand upon—which would be to blaspheme Religion, insult Reason and outrage Common Sense. A man who deliberately proposes as a thesis to be defended logically and theologically, that God made one part of his children to be the absolute property of another part, with all the incidents of property, is not worthy of a serious antagonism. "He is not fit to hear himself convinced." The proposition is an insult to the human understanding and the human heart. Slavery is not a logical or a mathematical question. It can neither be set up or overthrown by reasoning or demonstration. It is a matter of first principles, of axioms, of self-evident propositions. All that is necessary to overthrow all the fallacies and lies in which it takes refuge is the simple statement of universal truths and an appeal to the simplest instincts of human nature. "Would you choose to be a slave yourself?" is a formula of power to overthrow all the sophistries that theologians or politicians ever spin out of the letter of the Bible or the fictions of the law But though we cannot promise Mr. Brownlow Anti-Slavery foemen worthy of his steel, we will tell him what we should be willing to try and get for him. We should like to see him pitted against a Mormon Elder, and we will back this last (or would were we of the sporting world), that he will establish the Divine Origin, the Messianic permission, the Apostolic sanction and the general advantages of Polygamy, at every point of his sixteen divisions, by arguments every whit as cogent and by examples every jot as authoritative as Mr. Brownlow can bring in defence of American Slavery. If he will consent to this substitution, we will do our best to provide him with an antagonist, and we think we could even engage to secure him an audience.

We have said nothing about Colonel Netherland's defence of himself, because we have treated of that matter in another place. Mr. Brownlow is entirely in error as to our mode of carrying on the war, if he thinks that we should conceal from our readers anything so pat to our purpose as his own letter or that of his lay friend. But we thought that common courtesy, of which our Correspondent has set us so signal an example, demanded that we should give the shepherd his due precedence over the sheep.

CALL FOR A NORTHERN CONVENTION.

Whereas it must be obvious to all that the American Union is constantly becoming more and more divided, by Slavery, into two distinct and antagonistic nations, between whom harmony is impossible, and even ordinary intercourse is becoming dangerous;

And whereas Slavery has now gained entire control over the three branches of our National Government, Executive, Judicial and Legislative; has so interpreted the Constitution as to deny the right of Congress to establish freedom even in the Territories, and by the same process has removed all legal protection from a large portion of the people of the free States, and has inflicted, at many times and places, outrages far greater than those which our fathers rose in arms to repel;

And whereas there seems no probability that the future will, in these respects, be different from the past, under existing State relations;

The undersigned respectfully invite their fellow-citizens of the Free States to meet in Convention, at Cleveland, Ohio, on WEDNESDAY and THURSDAY, October 28th and 29th, 1857, to consider the practicability, probability and expediency of a separation of the Free and Slave States, and to take such other measures as the condition of the times may require.

Maine.
John R. Banton,
William Cushman,
J. B. Drew,
John Hanscom,
S. S. Henderson,
Peter Libbey,
Isaac J. Merrill,
Peter L. Morrill,
John O. Parmer,
M. F. Whittier.

New Hampshire.
A. Bronson Alcott,
Alonzo Allen,
Benjamin Chase,
Jehiel Claflin,
P. B. Coggswell,
R. K. Gould,
B. F. Hutchinson,
Geo. O. Paul,
Jos. Philbrick,
Nathaniel White.

Vermont.
Alonzo Blair,
T. S. Bliss,
W. H. H. Claflin,
John Gilliss,
William Hayward,
N. R. Johnston,
Cromwell Leonard,
Chauncey Richardson,
Joshua Ross,
S. M. Seaver.

Massachusetts.
William I Bowditch,
Amos Binney,
Chauncey Clark,
C. H. Codman,
Elnathan Davis,
Thomas Earle,
Nathaniel Hall,
Charles F. Hovey,
John P. Jewett,
Frank B. Sanborn.

Rhode Island.
J. C. Brown,
Samuel B. Chase,
John Helme Clarke,
Duty Evans,
Asa Fairbanks,
D. B. Harris,
T. M. Hathaway,
A. R. Janes,
A. Parmenter,
J. Towne.

Connecticut.
J. B. Barnes,
Eddy Harding,
J. C. Hebard,
Merrill Humphrey,
A Pettibone,
Philip Scarborough,
Riley Stillman,
Geo. W. Walbridge,
J. B. Whitcomb,
J. D. Wright.

New York.
James A. Burr,
William Henry Burr,
J. F. Cleveland,
S. H. Gay,
H. W. Gilbert,
O. Johnson,
S. J. May,
Isaac Post,
Robert Owen,
L. Wetmore.

New Jersey.
A. G. Campbell,
William Coates,
J. B. Grimes,
J. P. Hutchinson,
Samuel S. James,
Rowland Johnson,
Seth H. Leap,
Benjamin Rulon,
Thomas B. Thorn,
Philip Woolton.

Pennsylvania.
Caleb C. Hood,
W. W. Justice,
Edward Paramor,
J. M. McKim,
Robert Purvis,
John Tillinghast,
W. W. Walker,
Charles P. Walton,
John Whitely,
Thomas Whitson.

Ohio.
Abraham Brooke,
John DeGraw,
Joseph Heighton,
Robert Hiller,
Chester Nash,
William F. Parker,
F. J. Reeve,
M. R. Robinson,
Zaphna Stone,
Joshua Whinery.

Michigan.
J. Carroll,
Edward Y. Cornell,
John E. Dey,
Barton Durfee,
F. G. Hooker,
R. W. Melendy,
A. L. Power,
L. B. Russell,
W. Weeks,
J. H. Woods.

Indiana.
A. H. Buckman,
I. M. Frost,
William Hayward,
Jehu Hiatt,
John Jay,
Harris Jenness,
Lemuel S. Jones,
Thomas B. Morse,
T. T. Puckett,
John M. Thornburgh.

Illinois.
Moses Bishop,
C. B. Campbell,
A. J. Grover,
T. C. Haywood,
A. S. Hoadley,
F. Hoover,
John Phinney,
A. R. Russell,
John S. Stafford,
B. G. Wright.

Wisconsin.
Alfred Aspinall,
Benjamin Bollard,
Lyman Brooks,
Joseph Doolittle,
N. W. Martin,
D. H. Morgan,
W. S. Ottman,
E. D. Phelps,
Gilbert S. Skeel,
J. M. Westover.

Iowa.
Elijah Bushby,
Henry B. Clarke,
J. P. Davis,
O. Hambleton,
W. H. Hanna,
Lot Holmes,
Edwin James,
Benjamin D. Pierce,
Edward Turner,
Cromwell Wilson.

Minnesota.
Benj. B. Beall,
A. E. Bemis,
N. M. Bemis,
O. C. Blakeslee,
Henry Blakeslee,
H. M. Blakeslee,
J. Mortimer Hall,
P. Sherman,
Otis R. Spurr,
J. M. Vining.

Note. The unexpectedly large number of signatures to this call renders it impossible to print more than a few names from each State. An analysis of the whole list is given below. It is evident that by more systematic effort the number might have been increased ten-fold. As it is, however, it is not known that any Convention in the United States was ever summoned by so large a number of persons.

Committee of Arrangements.

Thos. Wentworth Higginson, Wendell Phillips,
F. W. Bird, Daniel Mann,
William Lloyd Garrison,
Joseph A. Howland, *Secretary.*

States.	*Legal Voters.*	*Others.*	*States.*	*Legal Voters.*	*Others.*
Maine,	33	22	Ohio,	1,187	570
New Hampshire,	56	29	Michigan,	315	131
Vermont,	53	9	Indiana,	351	123
Massachusetts,	945	380	Illinois,	124	46
Rhode Island,	79	24	Wisconsin,	87	32
Connecticut,	62	40	Iowa,	136	45
New York,	509	253	Minnesota,	8	4
New Jersey,	21	12	Others,	7	4
Pennsylvania,	227	109			
Total, . . .	6,033	persons.		4,200	1,833

The Annual Anti-Slavery Fair at Worcester was held in that city last week, a valuable and beautiful collection of goods and articles—all of them the donation of friends of the American Anti-Slavery Society—being exhibited in Brinley Hall. Owing to the almost panic-stricken condition of the people of Worcester and neighbouring towns, by reason of the disturbed state of business and the many failures of individuals and corporations, the receipts of the Fair will be somewhat reduced from the average of former years. But its friends have the satisfaction of feeling that their efforts will have added a handsome sum to the treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society.

Several other public shows and Fairs were held in Worcester during the week, but it was said that the Anti-Slavery Fair was the only one that so much as paid its expenses.

COLONEL NETHERLAND'S DEFENCE.

We give place this week to the statement of Colonel Netherland, of Rogersville, Tenn., in reply to the charges of cruelty to slaves, brought against him by the Rev. Samuel Sawyer, whose Statement was published in The Standard of Aug. 29th. We also insert with equal promptness, and in a conspicuous place, a letter addressed to us by the Rev. W. G. Brownlow, editor of the Knoxville (Tenn.) *Whig*, and devoted in part to a defence of Col. Netherland. Both of these letters we commend to the careful and candid attention of our readers. Mr. Brownlow asks, "Will you have the magnanimity to publish his (Col. Netherland's) reply?" and adds: "I suppose not, for it carries on its face the evidence of truth, and if published by you, must insure the swift demolition of all the falsehoods you have paraded before your readers on that subject, even among the most bigoted of your abolition readers." It is natural that an editor in Tennessee, where freedom of speech and freedom of the press in opposition to slavery is suppressed by the terrors of the Lynch code, and where every avenue through which a knowledge of the true principles and purposes of the Abolitionists might be expected to reach the minds of the Southern people is guarded with a jealousy more watchful and menacing than that whereby the crowned despots of the Old World preserve their subjects from the contaminating influence of Republican ideas, should doubt the willingness of the anti-slavery press to allow a slaveholder a fair opportunity of speaking for himself. That Mr. Brownlow should anticipate on our part the same anxiety to conceal from *our* readers the defence of Col. Netherland that the Colonel himself and his friends exhibited for the suppression of Mr. Sawyer's Statement—an anxiety which in their case found vent in threats of prosecution against the printers, causing them in their alarm to destroy eleven-twelfths of the edition and to attempt to destroy the rest—is only another illustration of the common maxim that men instinctively judge others by themselves. The judgment in this case, as Mr. Brownlow must admit, is utterly at fault, since we announced last week our purpose to print Col. Netherland's communication, and actually had it in type before Mr. B.'s letter was received. We trust that Mr. B., after reading this article, will duly appreciate not only our "magnanimity," but our courage, in volunteering to publish a statement which, according to him, "must insure the swift demolition" of all that is precious in our eyes!

Col. Netherland appears as a witness in his own case, and if we may not fairly set aside his testimony, so far as it is intended to exculpate himself, as wholly unworthy of confidence, we may at least reasonably assume that he has put in the strongest possible light every mitigating circumstance, and that Mr. Sawyer's narrative, even if erroneous in some respects, is certainly true in all those particulars in which he (Col. N.) does not contradict it. We propose, therefore, to compare the Statement of Col. N. with that of Mr. Sawyer, with a view to discover how far they contradict and how far they agree with each other, and thus to determine the value of the Colonel's defence.

The cruelties described by Mr. Sawyer were alleged to have been inflicted upon two slaves, named *Abe* and *Anthony*. Let us consider the case of each by itself.

CASE OF THE SLAVE ABE.

The case is thus stated by Mr. Sawyer:

"The negro had been sold to be sent to Mississippi, and, rather than be separated from his wife and children, with no prospect of seeing them again, he escaped to the woods and lay hid for more than a year. He was found by some hunters, brought in and delivered to the trader." "The church-member (Col. Netherland) agreed that he should be openly and publicly whipped. *With his chains on, he was taken by the parsonage, the minister's house, to a field just back of the church; where he was whipped naked, tied to four saplings, each arm and each foot tied to a sapling, blindfolded, so that he could not see when the blows were coming, and pinned to the earth.* It was said he needed but the yoke or a two-tined fork over his neck to finish this Mississippi scene. A bystander, from motives of humanity, spread his clothes under his stomach, to keep him from the rocks and the bare ground. A leather strap had been nailed to a wood handle for the occasion. Thus far there had been various spectators. The crowd was now requested to stand some distance off, as they wanted to get some confession from the boy as to who harboured him, &c. They retired a little distance, but where they could still hear the blows, and witness the scene, and hear the negro's cries." "The whipping commenced. It was currently reported in the community that it was administered by a man too often under the influence of intoxication, with revengeful feeling because the negro had escaped him once before, and with profane words—that the negro cried for mercy—that he whipped on till he gave him three hundred and thirty odd blows, and would probably have given him more had not the nails come loose from the strap. All this, too, was publicly witnessed by a number of the citizens and a number of the College students. Some counted the blows and waited about two hours till the whole was over, then went up and looked at the body and the bloody strap with which he had been beaten; others, sick at heart, turned away from the revolting scene and went to their homes."

In reply to this circumstantial narrative, in the publication of which Mr. Sawyer braved the hostility of every slaveholder and slave-trader in the vicinity, and exposed himself to the vengeance of they Lynchers, what has Col. Netherland to offer? Let the reader turn to the first page and see for himself. In the first place, he tells us that the negro was a man of immoral and desperate character, which might be admitted to be true without invalidating one of Mr. Sawyer's statements. He was sold, it is said, for "drunkenness, gambling and laziness"—faults which, if he was guilty of them, he not improbably contracted from the numerous examples all around him of drunken, gambling and lazy white men. "He had taken up," says Col. N., in the language of the plantation, "with a free mulatto prostitute." In a community where the virtue of no coloured woman is safe from the forceful assaults of lecherous white men, it is hardly to be expected that a slave's standard of female virtue should be very high, but the testimony of this accused slaveholder as to the character of poor Abe's wife should be received with caution, since he is under a strong temptation to be unfair if not to be false. It is for the interest of every slaveholder that his "boys" should "take up" with *slave* wives; and it is by no means unlikely that Abe was sold less for the faults named than because, being unwilling to become the father of slaves, he chose a *free* woman for his companion. Mr. Sawyer says he escaped to the woods on account of his attachment to his wife and children; and while there is nothing in Col. N.'s statement inconsistent with this allegation, it would seem to derive confirmation from the revengeful feelings he exhibited towards his wife when he discovered that she had "taken up" with another. The reader must judge for himself how much credit should be given to Col. Netherland's statements as to the character of this poor negro, who cannot speak for himself; and it is only fair to give the latter the benefit of such inferences in his favour as may be legitimately drawn from admitted facts. He certainly had the sympathy and good-will of his fellow-slaves, or they would not have braved the vengeance of their masters by siding him in his concealment. What must be the character of slavery, when its victims hide themselves in dens and caves of the earth, live for years upon the scanty provisions stealthily conveyed to them by their fellow-slaves, and consent to be hunted as outlaws, rather than submit to its dreadful conditions! And what must be the state of society where immortal children of God, for their unwillingness to be slaves, and to be separated forever from their families, are pursued like wild beasts and exposed to be shot by any white scoundrel who can carry a gun?

Waiving, however, all question as to the character of the slave, let us see what Col. Netherland admits and denies as to the flogging. He admits that it was administered *by his advice*, but asserts that it "*was not equal in severity to* 39 *lashes with a cowhide.*" Mark his words! He does not deny that the number of the blows (three hundred and thirty odd!) was correctly stated by Mr. Sawyer, but only affirms that they *did* "*not equal in severity* 39 *lashes with a cowhide*"! This statement he asks us to believe on his own authority alone, though he admits that he was three miles away when the flogging was administered, and although we have the testimony of Mr. Sawyer, confirmed by that of two Elders of the Church, that the revolting scene "was witnessed by a number of the citizens and a number of the College students," whose ears, for the space of two hours, were saluted by the poor negro's piteous cries for mercy, mingled with the oaths of the scoundrel whom Mr. Blevins and the pious Col. N. employed as the executioner of their vengeance; that some of the spectators "counted the blows" and afterwards looked at the bound and prostrate body and the bloody instrument of torture, while "others, sick at heart, turned away from the revolting scene and returned to their homes." Not one of the cruel details of the flogging, as related by Mr. Sawyer, does Col. N. venture to deny, except the allegation that the victim was blindfolded. Every other specification—the leading of the chained victim by the parsonage to the field in the rear of the church, the shameful denudation, the lashing to the saplings, the kindness of the bystander in spreading his clothes under his stomach to keep him from the rocks and the bare ground—all these circumstances, not being denied, we may assume as admitted to be true. And of all this the pious Col. Netherland says, "I APPROVE OF IT FULLY." Those who know enough of slavery to understand the feelings of the master toward a slave who has run away can judge for themselves whether it is likely that poor Abe was chained, stripped naked and tied in the manner described *merely* for the purpose of a *light* punishment! "*I told him* (Mr. Blevins) *that he ought to punish him for his villanies.*" Look at the catalogue of "villanies" which Col. N. attributes to Abe, and judge whether it is probable that "the object was to frighten more than to hurt him."

THE CASE OF ANTHONY.

Mr. Sawyer's account of this case we must here repeat. If our readers ask why we again call their attention to such a tale of revolting cruelty, we must remind them that, in pleading the cause of the outraged slaves, it will not do to relax the demands of justice and disobey the voice of conscience in deference to the weakness of our nerves. If we would help the slaves, we must not stop our ears to their cry of anguish. Though you shudder with indignation and horror, read!

"The same Church-member (Col. N.) had taken an old gray-headed servant, that had helped nurse him in childhood, and, on mere suspicion, it was said, that he knew the hiding-place of the runaway, he had given him to the same negro-trader to be ironed, taken to a neighbouring County and whipped at discretion. It was reported that this trader had stopped with the servant at Bean's station; that he took him to a stable on the public highway, and, in the loft, stripped him naked, stretched him on a plank, tied his arms together under the plank, strapped his feet to a post, and tied his head forward to a brace, so that he could not move, or, in the slightest degree, evade the blows; that he whipped him with a carpenter's hand-saw—a Mississippi way of whipping—which raises large blisters and bursts them, cutting the hide in pieces; that he whipped him ON SUNDAY, whipped him till the neighbours closed their doors, shut down their windows and dropped their curtains to keep from hearing the blows and the negro's cries for mercy—whipped him till the women of the place cried out against it—till one man said, if it was not stopped, he would return him to Court—till the landlord, after he had given him, as he supposed, at least three hundred blows with the saw, went to him and told him that he must put an end to it, that he himself was liable to indictment for suffering such things on his premises, and that he was unable and unwilling to bear it longer; that the trader became angry that any man should interfere with his whipping a slave even on Sunday; that he hired a little boy to get him a bundle of whips, with which he intended to whip him over the raw flesh, after his back should be blistered and cut with the saw. It was said that the trader, after the landlord arrested his whipping, manacled the negro, and, shaking the dust off of his feet in disgust against the Bean Station people, he went on to Rutledge; that the slave had two fits or spasms, as the effects of the whipping, one in the buggy and one in the jail, when the irons were taken off his limbs (hypocrite fits, of course, as the trade allows no limits to the endurance of a slave); that nevertheless the trader stripped him the next day, tied him up in the jail, and, although the sheriff and the jailer were opposed to his being whipped there, taking advantage of the absence of the jailer he took three sticks from a loom and whipped him over the raw flesh, to make him tell what it is believed by many he did not know, and of course could not tell, and that in this respect the testimony of the servants corresponded; that, not satisfied with his confessions, he gave out word that he would whip him again the next day; that the jailer resolved to prevent the jail being used any more for such a purpose, and the inspectors instructed him not to suffer it; and that most of these particulars of the whipping the trader himself acknowledged in the statements he made to various individuals. After remaining at Rutledge *nearly a week to heal up his back*, the gray-headed old servant, the *Sabbath evening* after the whipping of the runaway, returned home. The horrible details of this whipping of Anthony inflamed the public feeling of indignation against slave-trading cruelties. Yet it was whispered that the owner was responsible for it all, and justified it all. This was too much to be believed. It seemed a matter of astonishment, however, to many, that a respectable man, and a professing Christian man, should give his slave, who could depend upon his master alone for protection, to the tender mercies of a negro-trader, and tell him to whip him at his discretion—a gray-headed servant, too, that had nursed him in boyhood; a servant reputed as generally dutiful and exemplary, *and a member also of the Presbyterian Church* in common with his master."

What has Col. Netherland to say to this count of the indictment against him? Let the reader turn to his defence and see. He tells us that Anthony, instead of being "generally dutiful and exemplary," was a bad fellow; denies that he had been his (Col. N.'s) nurse in boyhood; and affirms that he was not whipped on suspicion, but with full knowledge that he was cognizant of Abe's place of concealment. Beyond this he denies nothing, but virtually admits everything alleged by Mr. Sawyer. He admits that he delivered the poor old man, a member like himself of the Presbyterian Church, to the inhuman Blevins, to be tortured at his discretion; and he does not deny, but virtually admits, that he *was* tortured exactly as Mr. Sawyer describes, ON SUNDAY—perhaps at the very hour when the pious master was mocking God with Pecksniffian whine and drawl of devotion in a house consecrated in the name of the beneficent Christ! And this is not all: In the same breath in which he impeaches the character of his aged servant and fellow Church-member, accusing him of various infractions of the moral law, he unblushingly owns that he did himself enter into a plot with the infamous Blevins to deceive the gray-headed negro and torture his mind with the apprehension that if he did not betray the secret of his fellow-slave, he would be sent off farther south and consigned to the tender mercies of the Legrees! This fact he relates with apparent unconsciousness that there is in it any implication of meanness or disgrace on his part. What a light does such a confession, from a man of high standing both in the world and in the Church (if in this case there may be said to be any distinction between the two), throw upon the whole system of slavery, both as to its effects upon the master and its cruelty to the slaves! If an eminent citizen and member of the Church can unblushingly declare that he deems it no violation of honour or of Christian morals to enter into a conspiracy with a "soul-driver" to deceive and torture a fellow Church-member and lacerate his flesh with a hand-saw, on Sunday, what must we think of slaveholders in general, who do not even profess to be under the restraints of religion? Look, too, at the spirit of Col. Netherland's defence. Is it not the spirit of a ruffian rather than that of a Christian gentleman? Is his temper that of a man defending himself against charges of which he is consciously innocent, or that of an unscrupulous and brazen tyrant, smarting from detection and exposure?

Having shown the utter worthlessness of Col. Netherland's boasted vindication, so far as it relates to the cruelties with which he stands charged, it is not necessary for us to offer any remarks upon other portions of his communication. A word in closing, however, we give to Parson Brownlow, who has volunteered as a witness in behalf of the pious negro-whipper, and who has only succeeded in showing himself to be as big a blockhead as he has long been known to be a ruffian. He professes to have "perused through" the number of The Standard containing Mr. Sawyer's Statement, and yet he did not succeed in getting it through his dull head that there was more than one case of flogging, for which Col. Netherland was held accountable! The case of Abe he treats as if it were the only one in question, and flatly gives us the lie, thus: "This runaway, fighting and otherwise turbulent slave (Abe), was severely whipped, *but it was not done on Sunday.*" Mr. Sawyer did not say, and *we* did not say that *this* slave was whipped on Sunday; but it *was* affirmed, and Col. Netherland does not deny, that *Anthony* was first flogged on that day of the week. The redoubtable Parson should study the case before proceeding to argue for the defence, for, in his present state of ignorance, he will only damage the cause of his client.

Ohio.—The *Bugle* brings cheering information of the wholesome agitation created in Northern Ohio by the labours of Messrs. Pillsbury, Foster and Foss, and Mrs. Colman and Miss Remond, aided in some places by B. S. Jones and James Barnaby. A debate, continuing two days, had been held at Ravenna, between Stephen S. Foster and Rev. Abram

honesty, that their religious professions might not be evil spoken of!

Ninthly—The Christian Church, in the Apostolic age, not only admitted the existence of slavery, but in various ways, by her teachings and discipline, expressed her *unqualified approbation* of it, enforcing the observance of the "Fugitive Slave laws," that had been enacted by the State. And, in the various acts of the Church, from the days of the active labours of the Apostles, downward through several centuries, she enacted laws and adopted regulations touching the duties of *masters* and *slaves*, as such, which, in my humble judgment, amounts to a justification of the institution of slavery.

Tenthly—The Scriptures of both the Old and New Testaments teach, certainly and conclusively, that God instituted the practice of men, women and children into bondage, and intended the relation of *master* and *slave* to exist throughout the habitable world. Hence, when God, in his providence, opened the way for the organization of the Church, the Apostles and first teachers of Christianity found slavery *incorporated into every department of society*; and, in the adoption of rules for the government of the members of the Church, they wisely and justly provided for the rights of *owners* and the wants of the *slave!*

Eleventh—Slavery, in the age of the Apostles, had so penetrated society, and was so intimately interwoven with it, just as it is in these Southern States, that a *religion preaching freedom to the slave* would have arrayed against it the civil authorities, armed against itself the whole power of the State, and destroyed the usefulness of its preachers. St. Paul knew this, and did not assail the institution of slavery—justified its existence, and laboured to get both *masters* and *slaves* to Heaven, as all well-informed and true-hearted ministers are now doing!

Twelfth—Slavery having existed ever since the first organization of society, and of the Church, the Scriptures clearly teach that it will exist to the end of time. Revelations vi., 12–17, points to "The Day of Judgment," "The Last Day," "The Great Day," and the condition of the human race at that time, as well as the *classes* of persons to be judged, rewarded and punished. A portion of this impressive and significant text reads, "and the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every BONDMAN, and every FREEMAN," will be there, evidently teaching that slavery will exist, and that the relations of *master* and *slave* will be recognised, to the end of time!

Thirteenth—Neither the *politicians* nor *divines* at the North are entitled to confidence who are engaged in the villainous agitation of the slavery question. They are exciting the whole country, and fuming society into a livid, consuming flame, while they have no sympathies for the black man, and care nothing for his comfort. President Pierce had thirty-five hundred New England parsons after him at one time, "in the name of Almighty God." President Buchanan has forty Connecticut parsons after him, the old Bashan number, agreeing to the *forty bulls* of Bashan, threatening him with "terrible majesty," if he shall fail to make Kansas free.

> "Oh for a forty-Parson power,
> To sing thy praise, hypocrisy!"

Fourteenth—I know from personal observation among the free negroes at the North that they are more miserable and destitute, as a whole, than the slave population of the South. Their freedom is only an empty name; and even the pleasures of life are denied the free negroes of the North by your hollow-hearted and hypocritical citizens, full of sympathy for the down-trodden African!

Fifteenth—African slaves were first imported into America in 1620, a century after their introduction into the West Indies. The *second* cargo landed on our shores landed in Boston, and for years the *pious* New Englanders kept up the traffic. They kept but few slaves among themselves, because it was not profitable to use negro labour in those cold and sterile regions. The people of New England were never, to a great extent, *slave-holding*; their virtuous and pious minds were chiefly exercised in *slave-stealing* and *slave-selling*. They stole the African from his native land, and sold him into bondage for the sake of gain. To New England the South is indebted for her first slaves; and when the New England States abolished slavery, they brought their negroes to the South and sold them before their laws could go into effect. And what few ships are in the slave trade now, at the peril of *piracy*, are New England ships!

Sixteenth—The cities and towns of the New England States now open a wider and more inviting field for faithful missionary labours than Hindóostan, Siam, Ceylon, or the western coast of Africa. New England is the *nursery* of all the dangerous and disorganizing doctrines, moral, social and political, which now threaten the overthrow of virtue and truth in the Union. As a people, they have forsaken the true God, and gone after "strange Gods." There is *Fourierism*, with its train of levelling precepts and degrading purposes; next comes *Free-love-ism*, that moral leper, striking at the very foundation of domestic virtue; next in order is *Mormonism*, which originated in your own State of New York, the cap-sheaf of modern debasement, striking at the very foundation of domestic peace and social happiness; then comes *Spiritualism*, the newly-discovered link between lost spirits in Hell and all deluded fanatics on earth; and the stack is topped out with *Abolitionism*, the great Moloch of political and religious fanaticism, which swarms of speculators, stock-jobbers, and villainous intriguers, with their debased and cunning agents, eager for public plunder, are seeking, with persevering eagerness and envenomed rapacity, to establish as the religion of the land!

Mr. Editor, these *sixteen* points I propose to discuss throughout the New England States; and as I must average 30 minutes on each, you will perceive that I require *eight* hours at every point; if, then, one of your *Reverend Freedom Shriekers* shall conclude to meet me, as I hope will be the case, we will require a week in each city. Duty, principle and expediency imperatively demand that the South should send among you a full corps of competent missionaries, at least by the opening of Spring. I am willing to lead the way, and would like to open the campaign on "Boston Common." The natural pitch of my *voice* will enable me speak to a ten-acre field of live Yankees without inconvenience to myself; and if you have any one of your pestiferous clergymen who has the lungs of an *ass*, trot him out, and I will make the track of his moral slime visible, like that of "snaky reptiles amidst yielding flowers." True, in this "work of faith and labour of love," I shall not expect my path to be strewed with flowers. Like Paul, I shall expect to encounter "beasts at Ephesus," and a variety of "wicked spirits" in the "high places" of the ungodly North. But may I not exclaim, in the sublime language of the poet,

> "Shall I be carried to the skies
> On flowery beds of ease,
> While others fought to win the prize,
> And sailed through bloody seas?"

I expect to be "in perils of waters (in journeyings often!), in perils of robbers, in perils by the heathen (the Yankees), in perils among false brethren; in weariness and fearfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness!" But if successful, as I expect to be to some extent, my reward will be the winning of souls from worse than paganism to the knowledge and love of Christ; and to the institution of slavery, which he and his Apostles favoured and vindicated.

I commenced this letter with a statement in reference to the case of Mr. Netherland, as falsely reported in your paper by Parson Sawyer. I conclude by calling your attention to Mr. Netherland's defence, which appears in my paper of to-day, and which I send you. Will you have the magnanimity to publish his reply? I suppose not, for it carries on its face the evidence of truth, and, if published by you, must insure the swift demolition of all the falsehoods you have paraded before your readers on that subject, even among the most bigoted of your Abolition readers.

W. G. BROWNLOW,
Sept. 19, 1857. Editor of the Knoxville *Whig*.

THE *Methodist Quarterly Review* for October contains two articles on slavery—one by the Rev. Dr. Thomson, of Delaware, Ohio, and the other (a review of Dr. Elliott's new work) by the Rev. Charles Adams, of Cincinnati. Dr. Thompson brings the claims of the slave home to various classes—slaveholders, ministers, editors, etc.—answering clearly and forcibly the excuses they urge for their inactivity in the anti-slavery movement. The article is sound in principle, though not as thorough on some points as could be desired. It is not disfigured by any of that abuse of radical anti-slavery men whereby the Rev. Abel Stevens is accustomed to propitiate the favour of the pro-slavery party. Mr. Adams bestows unqualified commendation upon Dr. Elliott's work, not alluding at all to his doctrine that slavery had a place in the Apostolic Churches and may rightfully be allowed, in certain circumstances, at the present day.

The other articles in this number are creditable to the literary character of the work, and will be generally interesting to religious readers of every class.

New York: Carlton and Porter, 200 Mulberry street.

THE WESTERN CONVENTIONS.

WE continue to receive the most cheerful accounts from the agents who are making the tour of the Western States. Mr. PILLSBURY, in a letter just received, thus speaks in general terms of the campaign:

"So far, our Western operations appear to prosper. We have never had larger, more interesting or successful gatherings since my connection with the cause began.

"We cannot answer nearly all the calls made upon us for lectures in Ohio, to say nothing of States farther west, even beyond the Mississippi. I often sigh for the health and vigour of former years.

"If our political lookers-on, who have so often stigmatized us as the '*Do-Nothing party*,' would some of them come with us one month, we would show them what is meant, in apostolic parlance, by '*instant in season and out of season*.'

"Nor did we ever labour with better effect than at present. The Western Anniversary was certainly one of the best ever held. And the key-note then struck is the tone of nearly all our meetings since. At Marlboro' and New Lisbon, the Remonds did themselves great honour, and the cause most essential service. Then they came to New Brighton, and began a series of evening lectures to excellent audiences, who heard with deep attention.

"Meanwhile, Mrs. Foster and myself made a very encouraging visit to Canfield, the county seat of Mahoning. The court-house was well filled, and our work was far from thrown away.

"Then, on Friday last, we came and joined the Remonds here in New Brighton, and have realized a genuine revival of anti-slavery. The town was perhaps never so moved by its importance before.

"We also hear good accounts from the more southern Counties of Ohio, where Mr. Foss and Mrs. Coleman are labouring. Mrs. Coleman is a new ally, but promises well, I am told by those who have heard her lectures. At a meeting in New Garden, there was much opposition to her and Mr. Foss, and some very shameful demonstrations, but all on the outside of the house. With that exception, our meetings have been all that we could wish in the way of earnest and respectful attention, at least so far as I have seen or heard.

"The Republican party is troubled at our presence and prospects, though very many of its supporters are listening to us with more pleasure and profit than ever before. The deliberate disfranchisement of free coloured citizens, not only by the Topeka Constitution, but also in Minnesota and Iowa, to say nothing of Connecticut and other strong Free State or Republican localities, is a fearful confirmation indeed of the Dred Scott decision, that '*the black man has no rights which the white man is bound to respect*'!!"

Mr. REMOND, in a private letter, from which we venture to make an extract, after excepting to the coldness of the people, and especially the Republicans, in one of the places visited, says:

"Of our meetings in the other places I cannot, perhaps, speak too highly. Large numbers come out to hear us, and to our strongest expressions and most radical propositions they give the heartiest responses; and I have been surprised to learn the numbers who do not bend the knee or bow the head at the behest of the Government, or pay homage to the Union, or vote under the Constitution; and were I in the habit of using sectarian phrases, I should say Ohio was in an *interesting* condition for anti-slavery efforts. Our calls are more numerous than we can comply with. Since I have been in the State, I have spoken very constantly, and find myself rather worse for the wear, and may be obliged to confine myself to five out of seven evenings."

HENRY WARD BEECHER preached two discourses last Sunday upon the moral causes and aspects of the great commercial revulsion under which the country is now labouring. The frauds in the management of Railroad and other corporations, as well as in private business, which have lately astounded the people and paralyzed commerce and trade by impairing confidence in human integrity, he declared were the natural fruits of the *lower law* doctrines so extensively promulgated from influential American pulpits and presses. The merchants who rushed to Castle Garden in 1850, to exalt an infamous law of Congress above all the laws of God and scoff at the claims of humanity and justice, were now reaping as they had sown. Of all classes of men none could so ill afford to undermine the foundations of conscience as the merchants, as they were now finding to their cost. Mr. Beecher treated the subject with his usual boldness and eloquence. The large house was thronged at both services, and in the evening thousands who went were unable to gain admittance.

THE NEW YORK STATE FREE SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION held a meeting in this city last week. The attendance was small, few of the coloured people in the city and vicinity seeming to manifest any interest in the proceedings. This certainly is not to their credit. The object of the Association is praise-worthy and important, and should command the united support of those who desire to attain for themselves the right of suffrage. *The Tribune*, we regret to say, not only treated the Convention most unfairly, but made an unjustifiable and untruthful assault upon the character of the coloured people of this city, exaggerating their faults, ignoring their virtues, and holding the mass responsible for the vice and crime of the few. The article to which we allude naturally excited the indignation of many of the coloured people, and on Tuesday evening a meeting was held at the Bethesda Church, when it was replied to, at length, and with much ability, by Wm. J. Watkins, of Rochester. He presented authentic statistics, contradicting conclusively some of Mr. Greeley's aspersions.

LECTURES IN BROOKLYN.—Arrangements have been made for the delivery of a course of Lectures, in the Brooklyn Athenæum, on successive Monday evenings, commencing early in November. The course will be under the direction of a Committee of the Second Unitarian Church (Rev. Mr. Longfellow's), and the following gentlemen are announced to take part therein. The Rev. Messrs. T. S. King, William R. Alger, and Theodore Parker, of Boston; Dr. William Elder, of Philadelphia; Rev. Mr. Stone, of Bolton. Mass.; Rev. Samuel Johnson, of Lynn, and Wendell Phillips, of Boston.

SLAVE-TRADE IN CUBA.—The slave trade in Cuba was never more flourishing, even in the palmiest days of its legalization, than it is now. Latterly, an American ship, loaded with Africans, was captured by a Spanish cruiser; but, as a set-off to this, the daily journals are informed that a Spanish schooner landed 380 negroes in the very port of Havana, without any interference from Government officials. It is scarcely possible that this could be done without the knowledge of the Captain-General, and hence we must infer that there is some foundation for the charges of corruption made against His Excellency, Don Jose de la Concha.

MICHIGAN.—We learn from the *Bugle* that the Anniversary of the Michigan Anti-Slavery Society will not be held at the time and place named in the call published last week, having been postponed till further notice. Parker Pillsbury and Charles L. and Caroline P. Remond will, however, commence their labours in the State at a Convention to be held to-day and to-morrow (Saturday and Sunday) at Ann Arbor.

FRESH LEAVES: By FANNY FERN. New York: Mason Brothers.

This volume contains one story which has never before appeared in print, "the hundred-dollar-a-column story" originally published in the *New York Ledger*, and a collection of the later fugitive pieces of the author.

Summary.

The Southern States furnish to the exhibition of the American Institute twelve articles. Of these twelve, it appears, one was manufactured by a slave. It is a chair, called "Uncle Tom's Chair," manufactured by "Uncle Tom Corbyn, an aged slave, near Norfolk, Va."

HELPER'S BOOK.—Mr. Helper's book, "The Impending Crisis," has already had a fine success. The publishers, we learn, have issued 13,000 copies. Orders have been received from several slave States, and one gentleman in Pennsylvania alone ordered 500 copies for distribution.

Some of the Catholics at Norwich, Ct., publish a card addressed to their pastor, Rev. Daniel Kelly, in which they respectfully ask him to try to abstain from the use of profane and immoral expressions in the presence of their children. They quote certain phrases, which are certainly unbecoming in a Christian priest.

GEORGIA BEATITUDES.—The Georgia papers tell the following with characteristic unction: A lady, formerly a resident of Georgia, very much discontented with Mississippi life, and longing to return to her native land, was shouting at camp-meeting last year, and became so excessively happy that she exclaimed, "Glory to God, *I feel like I was in Georgia!*"

Galignani says: "M. Babinet, the astronomer has just announced to the Institute that, in consequence of a favourable change in the currents of the ocean, a series of years of heat has been entered on, of which the present is the commencement.

Those currents do not seem to have touched our coast as yet. We have never had a colder season than this present.—*Tribune.*

A SINGULAR DYING REQUEST.—We find the following in that sober and truthful sheet, the Salem *Observer:* "An old man dying in Boston, recently, was asked if he would have a clergyman sent for. He requested to see Rev. Dr. Colyer, who called upon him accordingly. The sick man said: 'I have just sent to request you to keep those confounded cats in your yard quiet to-night.'"

NOTHING TO SMOKE.—The whole number of cigars exported from Havana up to the 15th of August, the present year, was 94,985,000, of which 29,681,000 were cleared for this country, 16,300,000 to Hamburg and Bremen, 9,628,000 to France, and 8,130,000 to Spain. The exports of tobacco amounted to 1,180,345 pounds, of which 528,636 pounds were cleared for this country.

It is estimated that there are 600,000,000 of human beings who use tobacco, and that the world produces annually 1,480,000,000 pounds of this fascinating and poisonous weed. Opium eaters number about 100,000,000; Indian hemp eaters, 100,000,000. The value of these articles consumed, to say nothing of coffee and tea, is computed at $300,000,000 per annum.

PIERCE AND ARNOLD.—A correspondent thus writes: "At a Lyceum held in Chester Academy last Friday evening, after an able discussion on the following question, 'Resolved, That Franklin Pierce is a baser traitor and scoundrel than Benedict Arnold,' it was decided by a vote of the members, 17 in the affirmative to four in the negative. The chapel of the Academy was full and it was one of the best Lyceums that has been held in this place for some years.—*Bellows Falls (Vt.) Times, Sept.* 23.

VOLUNTARY ENSLAVEMENT.—Elizabeth Bickley, a free girl of colour, aged about 22 years, voluntarily went into slavery at the present term of the Abingdon Circuit Court. She was bought by Captain Samuel Skinner, Sheriff of this County. This is the first instance of the kind we have heard of, says the Abingdon *Democrat*, in this end of the State. The woman is very intelligent, and was fully aware that a kind master was better able to provide and care for her than she was herself. This is a nut for Yankee philosophy to crack.—*The (Richmond) South.*

HIGH PRICE FOR NEGROES.—We have often heard that a thing was worth its weight in silver, but did not think we would ever see negroes sell for such a price. A few days since a gentleman of this place paid $1,200 a piece for five negro girls, from twelve to fifteen years of age. Reckoning silver at twelve ounces to the pound, which is Troy weight, the negroes, allow them a hundred pounds weight each, cost just their weight in silver.

The crazy prophecy of some man that negro fellows would, in five years, bring $5,000, will, we believe, be fulfilled.—*Eutaw (Ala.) Whig.*

CAPT. HERNDON'S LAST MEMENTO TO HIS WIFE.—A few days since, Mr. Payne, of California, called on Mrs. Herndon and presented her with a watch which had been entrusted to his care by Captain Herndon, of the ill-fated steamship Central America. It seems that this brave officer knew well the fate that awaited the steamer, but he scorned to desert his charge, and preferred dying to surviving the disaster. But with death staring him in the face he could not but think of his family, and he entrusted his watch to Mr. Payne, to be presented to his wife as a token of affection. The fate of the gallant Herndon will long be remembered and mourned.

PROPOSAL.—A writer in the Charleston *Mercury* proposes the establishment of a Southern Mercantile Association with a local agency in New York, and auxiliary agencies in other Northern cities, if need be, for the purpose of learning who are worthy and who are not, of Southern patronage, and the South will very soon be saved the necessity of contributing to the wealth of those who steal away her slaves. It represents that the advantages of such a system would be immense. It is to be modelled upon what the *Mercury* styles the "system of espionage" known as Mercantile Agencies at the North. Must the South *copy* the North even in such a matter as this?—*N. Y. Times.*

THE SOUTH AND THE TRACT SOCIETY.—The Southern papers are not content with the course of the American Tract Society, in ignoring the relation of master and slave, and even the existence of slavery, and in expurgating from its publications the writings of even Southern men upon the subject that everybody talks about, that all the papers write about, that all the people think about. The fact is, the Southern people know that such abject submission cannot be honest; they accept the act, but they will not trust the men who perform it; they despise the subserviency which they command.—*Providence Journal.*

We understand that Rev. Daniel Foster, who, it will be recollected, left for Kansas in the beginning of the summer, and who has spent the intervening months in taking the census for the Free State Committee, and aiding to organize protection for the ballot-boxes, will return to Massachusetts in October, or early in November. He intends lecturing here on "Kansas and her Pioneers," and we hope the various Lyceum and Lecture Committees in New England will bear him in mind in making up their courses. So interesting a subject from an eye-witness cannot fail to get an audience.—*Liberator.*

Would-be-Governor Payne said in his Court-House speech, in the hearing of over *one hundred* people, that the coloured population of this city were "poor, miserable, worthless creatures." There are from 450 to 500 free negroes in this city, two-thirds of them, on actual computation, are owners of real estate, and worth from one to seven thousand dollars. These facts can be substantiated and names given if desired. There are some worthless characters among them, as there are among the whites; but nothing could be more false or unfair than the sweeping assertion of the candidate of the Slave Democracy. But what can be expected of a man who hires himself out to play bloodhound for the slaveholder and the kidnapper?—*Cleveland Leader.*

Power of affection is as often illustrated in slaves as in white persons. Recently, a coloured nurse died in Washington from intense grief, occasioned by the death of a little white child she had in charge. A Washington paper remarks:

"This is but another illustration of the fervour of the affections that so pre-eminently characterizes the African race, especially when educated under the influences of kind and gentle associations."

No doubt this is true, but why not equally so when the poor slave is on a sugar or cotton plantation, and there has her infant taken from her arms and sold into slavery? It is often denied that negroes have any sensibility.—*N. Y. Evangelist.*

SENDING SOUTHERN BOYS TO NORTHERN COLLEGES.—We (*N. O. Picayune*) observe in some of our South Carolina exchanges a controversy concerning the course of two of the Trustees of Columbia (S. C.) College, who, it is said, have lately taken their sons to Northern Colleges. A writer, who signs himself "A Father," contends that it is the right and duty of a parent to select a college for his sons according to his own judgment of what is best for them. No one, he insists, has the right to hold up to public censure the exercise of this privilege. On this, the Charleston *Standard* sensibly remarks:

"The parent who, in this selection, gives the preference to a Northern College, ought to leave the management of our State Colleges to the men who are resolved to educate their sons at home."

CHARACTERISTIC.—We find the following in the *Christian Inquirer:*

Rev. John Pierpont, the poet of "Palestine," was at Niagara a summer or two ago, and it was a beautiful Sabbath morning, when he went out to worship, where the "light wave just breaks, and *whispers* of its Maker's might."

One of those officious, silly creatures, whose religion consists in a straight-bodied coat, and occupied pew, and two sermons a week, posted after the poet like a missionary after a heathen. His soul—what little he had—was crooked up into an interrogating point, and wriggled with anxiety for the sinner's welfare.

"Was Mr. Pierpont going to church?" "Yes." "And whom would he hear preach?" "GOD ALMIGHTY," was the brief and pertinent reply, as he turned again from the buzzing insect to the eloquence of Niagara.

NEGRO TESTIMONY.—The case of the State of Iowa, *agt.* Hull was tried in the District Court on Wednesday last. The defendant was charged with stealing hogs, but was acquitted by the jury. We allude to the case now, as being the first one which occurred in this court under the law of last winter, admitting negro testimony; and we hasten to announce to the universal world, and the "rest of mankind," that "although John Heiner, a coloured man, did actually get up and give his testimony in open court, before the bench, the bar, the jury and a great number of white men, yet the court still survives, the jury still lives, the world moves on as usual, and there is yet no 'amalgamation' that we have heard of, nor is the white race hopelessly degraded." Let us add that Heiner's testimony—which, by the way, was given in a clear and business-like manner—was submitted to the jury for what it was worth, just like any other man's.—*Keokuk Gate City.*

GOV. MARCY INTERESTED IN SPIRITUALISM.—In an account lately published of the last days of Hon. W. L. Marcy, from the pen of a citizen of Ballston, we find the following:

"Mr. Marcy, while here, seemed to be, and I think really was, interested in the subject of Spiritualism. The Wednesday evening before the Saturday on which he died, he sat up until nearly 12 o'clock, engaged in earnest conversation on this and other subjects of a similar nature, with Dr. Moore, of Ballston, and a few other friends. But whatever his opinions may have been, he concealed them, and confined himself to asking questions, suggesting difficulties, and occasionally giving a sly hit to those who were most enthusiastic. Mr. R——, one of the most zealous, stated as an evidence of the truth of Spiritualism, that a lady—a trance-medium—had spoken four hours without being exhausted. 'My dear sir,' said Mr. Marcy, 'I have known women in their normal state who could talk twelve hours without feeling the slightest fatigue.'"

INTERESTING TO DENTISTS.—Dr. Slayton, of Madison, Ind., has communicated a new method of plating to the *Dental News-Letter*, which we condense as likely to be interesting to our readers. He takes a set of teeth of silver, copper or brass, and after first carefully removing all grease, rubs one side with mercury until it has assumed the mirror appearance, and then with a pair of tweezers lays on the gold or other foil cut in small strips: he then carefully presses it into the teeth, rubbing it well in, and treats another side the same way and so on. He can lay as many thicknesses of foil as he likes, only taking care that one is firmly fixed before the other is begun. By placing the whole in a small oven, and applying a spirit lamp, the mercury is driven off, and burnishing with a bloodstone or steel burnisher, at first not leaning very hard, he obtains a rich gold plating, which will not even melt off, and can only be removed by a file.—*Scientific American.*

The treaty with Switzerland, which recognises the disabilities of the Jews, and refuses to an American citizen of the Hebrew faith the same rights and privileges that are given to other people, finds defenders in the South, where there are many Jews. The question is affected by the interests of slavery. The friends of the peculiar institution say if we deny to Switzerland the right to judge for herself who shall enjoy the privileges of citizenship, she will equally deny the right to us; if we say that American Jews shall be received on an equality in Switzerland, she may say that Swiss negroes shall be received on an equality in the United States. This settles the question; for although there are probably no such negroes who would ever claim the right, and there are American Jews who may constantly claim it, no good Democrat will doubt that it is better that all the Jews should remain disfranchised all over the world, than that the risk should be incurred of endowing one negro with any rights which white men would be bound to respect.—*Providence Journal.*

REVOLTING SPECTACLE.—The city of Richmond, in Virginia, as our readers are aware, is delightfully situated, and is one of the most beautiful cities in the Southern States. It is the capital of Virginia, and boasts of its wealth, refinement and intelligence. Richmond is one of the largest slave marts in the United States. Men, women and children are sold to the highest bidder, to the amount of millions of money, every year. Every week this horrid traffic is carried on, separating families, and filling many habitations of the poor and oppressed with indiscriminate anguish. A slave mart is a dreadful sight; once seen, the impression of it will never be forgotten. But there is a place in Richmond more revolting even than this. It is the railroad depot the morning after a sale, when the miserable slaves who are to be sent South are brought together to take their departure. The friends of the poor creatures, the fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, aunts, cousins, &c., come down to bid them a final farewell. If a man has any sensibilities, they will be thoroughly moved, as the cries and groans and wailings of these slaves fill the air. This occurs every week, sometimes nearly every day in the week.—*Lowell Courier.*

GEN. SCOTT AND THE IRISHMAN.—Quite a laughable incident occurred on the cars as I was coming from New York to Sing Sing, in which Gen. Scott figured, whether to his advantage or not, may be determined by you from what is to follow. The Gen. was occupying a seat to himself, and as the cars were considerably crowded, he had been asked several times by the conductor and by passengers who were on the lookout for seats, whether the other part of his seat was taken. To all their inquiries he replied in the affirmative, when, at last, a dirty-looking Irishman came along and put the same question. This was rather more than the General had the patience to bear—so he answered very sharply, "Yes, sir, every bit of it." Whereupon Pat's dander *riz* to such a pitch that he turned to and abused the General roundly, and having finally worked himself up to a boiling rage he stuck his profile into that of the General and called him *a d—d old snapping turtle!* As I was sitting just across the aisle from them, I began to fear I was destined to have a *dead Irishman* on top of me, and was getting ready to keep him off; but the General did not condescend to notice him further, and Pat, having vented his anger, left the car. As he was going out some one told him who it was he had been abusing; but instead of showing any signs of contrition, he said, "he didn't care who the devil it was; he had as good a right to his seat as any man."—M.—*The (Richmond) South.*

[Gen. Scott is less fond of "that Irish brogue" now than he was in 1853.]

PREACHERS HAS RIZ.—The Nashville *Whig* says the following conveys a practical lesson:

"HAWKESVILLE, Ky., Sept. 2, 1857.

"MESSRS. EDITORS: The following amusing incident occurred in our town a few weeks since. It will apply to other localities as well as this.

"A short time since it became necessary to adopt measures to procure the services of a minister of the African Church in this place. Accordingly a committee was appointed to wait upon 'Brudder Pearce' (who was generally acknowledged to be the most suitable personage to fill that high and honourable station), and solicit him to accept the pastorship of their Church. They were informed that he would undertake the laborious task for the very moderate sum of forty-five dollars per annum; but insignificant as the price seems, his flock thought it exorbitant, and peremptorily refused to give it.

"Two or three weeks passed, and, being unable to get another preacher, it was finally agreed to pay the stipend, and on the ensuing Sabbath the following took place:

"'Brudder Pearce, we'e 'cluded to gin you forty-five dollars to preach for us,' said a benevolent coloured individual; whereupon our clerical friend arose and responded:

"'Bredderen, I can't preach for that price.'

"'Why, you only axed forty-five,' cried a half dozen voices.

"'Shore nuff I did, bredderen, but dat you know was tree weeks ago, and preachers has riz.'"

OFFICIAL LITERATURE.—Recently a pro-slavery youth of Tecumseh, named Mack Edwards, stabbed his cousin of the same name and faith, so that the life of the latter was despaired of. His pro-slavery neighbours did not attempt to arrest him, but in order to let the matter blow by, the assassin started for that sanctuary of Border Ruffians, Missouri. While on his flight he passed through Lawrence. A man from the same town, who knew him, and the circumstances, reported it and the city officers of Lawrence arrested the fugitive. Not having jurisdiction in murder cases, the Mayor sent a letter to the United States Marshal. One of the numerous deputies of that functionary received it and sent his sub-deputy after the prisoner, bearing the following characteristic letter:

"LECOMPTON, August 30th, 1857.

"Col James Blood and others of Lawrence you will Please delivur Mack Edwards who stands charge with the stabing of F Edwards to Wm T Colwell who is authorise by me to recei v him and bring him hear giv en undur my hand

J m Tuton
Dep U State
marshall

"P S send sum one with him who will be willing to make an affidavid that he was so charge unless he will state it to Mr Colwell. J m T"

SOUTHERN BOOKS.—One of the great works proposed by the "Southern Commercial Convention," was the preparation of text books for Southern literary institutions, as the acknowledged sentiments of the civilized world, taught by Wayland and others, were deemed obsolete by that progressive body. A Committee was appointed to do this important work, and were to meet in Columbia, S. C. It included some of the most noted literary names of the South. It has been a total failure, and our confrere of the New Orleans *Advocate* satirizes it, and says: "The Convention in getting up Southern school books is a failure. On the 18th of May, not one of their Committee met in Columbia, S. C. A gentleman of this city, who sent on the manuscript of a text book for their examination, had it returned to him by the Postmaster of Columbia, with the words that 'not a man or dog was there.'" This fierce determination to ignore the sentiments of all Christendom, is a wretched farce of Southern demagogues. We doubt not that the common sense of the South generally blushes for it. The "reformers" are attempting a miracle—a fight against the inevitable laws of the moral world; their folly cannot fail to react sooner or later.—*Christian Advocate and Journal.*

WENDELL PHILLIPS AT BROWN UNIVERSITY.—His subject was *Education*, in the largest sense of that term. There was a lack of continuity of thought, but this was compensated by the matter itself, and the language and style. It was freighted with precious truth. The orator was calm, self-possessed, and with a dignity and propriety of language which put to silence all complaints from the most fastidious. But the utterance was that of a living man who had something to say. He spoke convictions that had been wrought into the very fibres of his mind. Many of his sentences were gems of the richest thought set in expressive and beautiful words. The address told well. How could it be otherwise? There was a man who stood up with the knowledge of the fact that he would utter what to many were unwelcome truths, yet he quailed not. With the faith of a prophet, and the chaste purity of a scholar, he aimed to aid the young men he addressed to understand the real aspect of the times, and the duty of true, earnest, and brave scholars. It is refreshing to hear such men speak. They quicken and make alive. It is easy to pass them by with the cold sneer "extravagant," "fanatical." This is not argument. The question which serious and earnest men should ask in the light of God's eternal laws is, is not what such as he says true? To this test the oration of Mr. Phillips can well be submitted. The crucible will leave a large residuum of rich ore.—*Cor. Chris. Inquirer.*

GOD-WARD AND MAN-WARD.—"Men know that Christianity, if it is anything, is a life; and that a man may pack away, serially, the Thirty-Nine Articles in his brain, that he may be a walking edition of the Catechism, that he may contend fiercely for the faith as he has received it, that he may pursue the rats of heresy with a scent as keen as that of a Scotch terrier, and persecute the man whom, in his distempered and presuming judgment, he has marked as a heretic, and yet he as vindictive, and selfish, and foul, as man can be. The world wishes for better fruits, and when these fruits shall manifest themselves, the propagators of Christianity will have less occasion to bemoan the lack of progress which their cause is making among men."

The above paragraph, though a part of a rebuke, administered by the Springfield *Republican*, a secular paper, to the conductors of certain religious journals, is worth the reading of all who bear the Christian name. Our holy religion was designed to regulate the every-day life of those who profess to be its subjects. But in how many instances does the "fruit" of Christianity, as exemplified in the ordinary duties of men, utterly fail to commend the gospel to those who have never felt its power? "Is Mr. —— good?" asked a bank officer of a Director, the other day, in the hearing of a friend of ours. "That depends on whether you mean God-ward or man-ward," was the answer. "God-ward," continued the Director. "Mr. —— is 'good.' No man in our Church is sounder in the faith, or prays oftener in our meetings, or is more benevolent, according to his means. But man-ward, I am sorry to say that Mr. —— is rather tricky."

We wish we could believe that Mr. —— is not the representative of a class of men somewhat prominent in the Churches.—*N. Y. Examiner.*

AN ESCAPE FROM SALT LAKE.—The following narrative is from the pen of John Davies, a young Welshman, who emigrated to Salt Lake with his family about two years ago from Maesteg, South Wales. It is taken from a private letter, dated Council Bluffs City, Iowa, June 29:

"I guess you are anxious to know the reason why I left Salt Lake. I shall try, in the first place, to inform you what a man must do to be a Mormon. He must give himself, his family, and all his possessions over to Brigham Young, and then he'll have to give the tenth of all his income—the tenth day's work—and he must keep from two to ten wives. If he don't agree to these things, he had better quit; but by doing so he is in danger of losing his life every minute, for they would rather kill him than to let him be the means of letting the world know how things are in their midst. Many have been shot down in trying to escape. I have seen dozens shot down on the street; and three days before I left I saw three persons killed merely because they intended to escape—they were shot down in a place called Springfield, while they were preparing their trunks to leave. This took place about 8 o'clock on Sunday morning, within fifty yards of the gates of the city. The first was a young man called William Parish; he received seven balls in his body. The second was his father, and the third was a man called Potter, whose body received as many as fifteen balls. The old man was pierced in the back and his throat cut in three different places. I saw them lying down, and I could name the persons who killed them. Brigham Young has got men for this purpose. Their number is four hundred. They are called the 'Destroying Angels.' Their Captain's name is William Hickman, and the second in command is Porter Rockwell.

"The walls around the city are 15 feet high, and they are surrounded by a deep and wide moat. The city is entered by four gates which are watched in the night time. The gates are so narrow that only one vehicle can pass through at once. The 'Destroying Angels' go out on the plains in the spring, in order to intercept those who may escape from the city. Many left on foot last January. They sleep by day and travel by night. I know of men and women who have travelled in this way—the men dressed as women, and the women as men. I came across some who were very short of food; the little they had they gave to the women, and the men were principally sustained by the women's milk!"

DE PROFUNDIS.—The following epistle (says the Chicago *Tribune*), under the frank of his Satanic Majesty, written upon a mysterious kind of salamander paper, was picked up by "our devil" near the post-office last night. The original MSS. has been handed over to the S. C. A. T. Society, where it may be seen by the curious.—ED.

[*Private.*]
R——, SANCTUM PANDEMONIUM,
September, 1857.

MY DEAR MOLOCH: Your despatch was handed me at the "witching time of night when graveyards yawn," by a late pro-slavery parson. The poor fellow was evidently somewhat indisposed at first—troubled with the heart-burn—but by a judicious application of burnt brandy, a few hot bricks at his feet, and a little "bell-broth," revived, and is now doing as well as could be expected under the circumstances. The reports from Kansas are cheering. Our friends there are managing things admirably. Governor Walker, I see from the *Delta* and *Mercury*, "is going to the devil." The Governor is a great favourite here and will meet with a warm reception. His "Isothermal" creed that the climate is too cold for slaveholders, is, in a measure, correct. Several recent arrivals complain of the great change. The Democratic papers you sent me are d—d good. Excuse my swearing; it's a habit I caught from a defunct Congressman. Their editors are capital rogues, and some of them the most superb liars I ever knew. It gives me a touch of the spleen sometimes, to read their magnificent yarns. There is the Chicago *Times* and the *Plaindealer* of Cleveland, for instance, I scarcely see a paragraph in either, "but with a sigh I wish it was mine."

I think we must get up a little display of fireworks when these editors come down. The grand pyrotechnic illumination will, of course, be reserved for Douglas. Speaking of Stephen, I cannot, as you propose, substitute our well-beloved cousin Fernando for the distinguished Senator in the heavy Falsehood Department. For massive, colossal, national kind of lying, he has no equal. I am not, as you know, a very affectionate spirit, but I do feel an ardent attachment for the "Little Giant." We hear fine things of Keitt. Let him continue to cultivate his taste for "white sulphur," he will find it greatly to his benefit hereafter. So our friend Mitchell is recommencing trade. That is devilish fine news. John's a splendid swearer. He has the agency for our blaspheming business.

When have you seen Brigham? Brigham's a gay old boy. We understand he is multiplying his "flames" at Salt Lake; we are doing the same thing for him here below.

But I must close:

"For by the pricking of my thumbs,
Something wicked this way comes."

This is the longest letter I have written, since the one I addressed to the Cincinnati Convention.

Give my love to Back. Send me the news by the first fire-eater.

Yours infernally, SATAN.

THE LATE POISONING CASE IN ALABAMA.—One of our subscribers from Pike County, informed us yesterday of a most horrible and atrocious case of poisoning in that County, just below the line of Montgomery, and in the neighbourhood of Bruceville. The annals of crime will hardly show a more extensive and diabolical piece of villainy.

It seems that a German, or Hungarian, whose name our informant had forgotten, was on intimate terms with a negro woman, the property of old Mr. Thomas Frazell, one of the earliest settlers of Pike. This man had once been in the employ of Mr. F., and was familiar with his premises. Some time since he had been detected in gambling with Mr. F.'s negroes, and Mr. F. had instituted a prosecution against him. On Saturday evening, 12th ult., he was seen in conversation with the negro woman alluded to, at the well, although he had received orders from Mr. Frazell never to come about his premises.

On Sunday there were some 37 persons dining at Mr. Frazell's house, of whom about 30 were visiters from the neighbourhood. All these became sick soon after eating, vomiting violently, and the cook being arrested immediately, on a suspicion

Miscellaneous Department.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

TO THE HERMIT-THRUSH.

HERMIT-THRUSH! 'tis sweet to be
Out in the Summer-woods with thee—
Far in their depths, so green and still,
That with thy tender music thrill,
Where a golden light through the maple gleams
In many-tinted emerald streams,
And nought is heard but the trembling gush
Of thy greenwood-music, hermit-thrush!

And while the sun his mellowed beams
Pours down on the dim, Autumnal streams,
And the brown leaf, dry and sere,
Eddies down to the hazy mere,
Lying broad and deep and still,
Stiller than the lazy rill,
Whose blue waters quiet seem
Gliding on in a long day-dream,
And a low murmur, far and wide,
Tells of the slowly-coming tide,
When, the Indian Summer o'er,
The storms shall come with vast uproar,
Still, in suit of hermit-brown,
Thou thy lay art trilling, down
Deep in the blue and quiet dells,
Careless whether the muser tells
Of thy music, or of thee,
Or thy life in the woodland-tree.

Hermit-thrush! amid the din
Of the city and its sin,
Thy very name, glad forest-child,
Cometh to me like a wood-note wild,
Bringing visions of the hills,
Bringing plashing of the rills,
And the sunshine's golden flask,
And the water's ceaseless dash—
And visions fair of the quiet field,
Where the sick in spirit may be healed,
Where the thistle-finch, with plumes of gold,
Ebon-winged and ebon-polled,
Sitting on the thistle's crown,
Scatters far its silvery down,
Floating in the silent air;—
And of sunny rambles where
I have found, in crevice lone,
Turned into enduring stone,
Feathery fern or antique shell
That its tale of eld doth tell,
Or the chickweed's tiny flower,—
A snow-star shining its little hour;—
And I long again to be away,
Where I might list to thy tender lay,
And forget the moiling crowd,
With its tumult harsh and loud,
And the dirtier demagogue still toiling
'Mid the mob with all its moiling,
Where, each the mess of garbage earns,
Leading, each, and led, by turns,
And am soon at home with thee,
Singing at peace in thy wildwood-tree,
And while these sounds in the distance cease,
Encamp afar on the plains of peace.

September, 1857. H. W. G.

OUR OLD GRANDMOTHER.

"I FIND the marks of my shortest steps beside those of my beloved mother, which were measured by my own," says Alexander Dumas, and so conjures up one of the sweetest images in the world. He was revisiting the home of his infancy; he was retracing the little paths around it in which he had once walked; and strange flowers could not efface, and rank grass could not conceal, and cruel ploughs could not obliterate his "shortest footsteps," and his mother's beside them, measured by his own.

And who needs to be told whose footsteps they were that thus kept time with the feeble pattering of childhood's little feet? It was no mother behind whom Ascanius walked "with unequal steps" in Virgil's line, but a strong, stern man, who could have borne him, and not been burdened; folded him in his arms from all danger, and not been wearied; everything, indeed, he could have done for him, but just what he needed most—he could not sympathize with him—he could not be a child again. Ah, a rare art is that—for, indeed, it is an art—to set back the great old clock of time, and be a boy once more! Man's imagination can easily see the child a man; but how hard it is for it to see the man a child; and he who had learned to glide back into that rosy time when he did not know that thorns were under the roses, or that clouds would ever return after the rain; when he thought a tear could stain a cheek no more than a drop of rain a flower; when he fancied that life had no disguise, and hope no blight at all—has come as near as anybody can to discovering the north-west passage to Paradise.

And it is, perhaps, for this reason, that it is so much easier for a mother to enter the kingdom of Heaven than it is for the rest of the world. She fancies she is leading the children, when, after all, the children are leading her, and they keep her indeed where the river is narrowest and air is the clearest; and the beckoning of the radiant hand is so plainly seen from the other side that it is no wonder she so often lets go her clasp upon the little finger she is holding, and goes over to the neighbours, and the children follow like lambs to the fold, for we think it ought somewhere to be written: "Where the mother is, there will the children be also."

But it was not of the mother we began to think, but of the dear, old-fashioned grandmother, whose thread of love, "by hand," on life's little wheel was longer and stronger than they make it now; was wound around and about the children she saw playing in the children's arms, in a true love knot, that nothing but the shears of Atropos could sever; for do we not recognise the lambs sometimes, when summer days are over, and autumn winds are blowing, as they come bleating from the yellow fields, by the crimson thread we wound about their necks in April or May, and so undo the gate and let the wanderers in?

Blessed be the children who have an old-fashioned grandmother. As they hope for length of days, let them love and honour her, for we can tell them they will never find another.

There is a large old kitchen somewhere in the past, and an old-fashioned fireplace therein, with its smooth old jambs of stone—smooth with many knives that have been sharpened there—smooth with many little fingers that have clung there. There are andirons, too—the old andirons, with rings in the top, wherein many temples of flame have been builded, with spires and turrets of crimson. There is a broad worn hearth, by feet that have been torn and bleeding by the way, or been made "beautiful," and walked upon floors of tesselated gold. There are tongs in the corner, wherewith we grasped a coal, and, "blowing for a little life," lighted our first candle. There is a shovel, wherewith were drawn forth the glowing embers in which we saw our first fancies and dreamed our first dreams—the shovel with which we stirred the sleepy logs till the sparks rushed up the chimney as if a forge were in blast below, and wished we had so many lambs, so many marbles, or so many somethings that we coveted; and so it was we wished our first wishes.

There is a chair—a low, rush-bottom chair; there is a little wheel in the corner, a big wheel in the garret, a loom in the chamber. There are chests full of linen and yarn, and quilts of rare pattern, and samplers in frames.

And everywhere and always the dear old wrinkled face of her whose firm, elastic step mocks the feeble saunter of her children's children—the old-fashioned grandmother of twenty years ago. She, the very Providence of the old homestead—she who loved us all, and said she wished there was more of us to love, and took all the school in the Hollow for grandchildren beside. A great expansive heart was hers, beneath that woolen gown, or that more stately bombazine, or that sole heir-loom of silken texture.

We can see her to-day, those mild blue eyes with more of beauty in them than time could touch or death do more than hide—those eyes that held both smiles and tears within the faintest call of every one of us, and soft reproof, that seemed not passion, but regret. A white tress has escaped from beneath her snowy cap; she has just restored a wandering lamb to its mother; she lengthened the tether of a vine that was straying over a window, as she came in, and plucked a four-leaved clover for Ellen. She sits down by the little wheel—a tress is running through her fingers from the distaff's dishevelled head, when a small voice cries, "Grandma," from the old red cradle, and "Grandma," Tommy shouts from the top of the stairs. Gently she lets go the thread, for her patience is almost as beautiful as her charity, and she touches the little red bark in a moment, till the young voyager is in a dream again, and then directs Tommy's unavailing attempts to harness the cat. The tick of the clock runs faint and low, and she opens the mysterious door, and proceeds to wind it up. We are all on tip-toe, and we beg in a breath to be lifted up one by one, and look in the hundredth time upon the tin cases of the weights, and the poor lonely pendulum, which goes to and fro by its little dim window and never comes out in the world, and our petitions are all granted, and we are lifted up, and we all touch with a finger the wonderful weights, and the music of the little wheel is resumed.

Was Mary to be married, or Jane to be wrapped in a shroud? So meekly did she fold the white hands of the one upon her still bosom, that there seemed to be a prayer in them there; and so sweetly did she wreathe the white rose in the hair of the other, that one would not have wondered had more roses buded for company.

How she stood between us and apprehended harm; how the rudest of us softened beneath the gentle pressure of her faded and tremulous hand! From her capacious pocket that hand was ever withdrawn closed, only to be opened in our own, with the nuts she had gathered, the cherries she had plucked, the little egg she had found, the "turn-over" she had baked, the trinket she had purchased for us as the product of her spinning, the blessing she had stored for us—the offspring of her heart.

What treasure of story fell from those old lips; of good fairies and evil, of the old times when she was a girl; and we wondered if ever—but then she couldn't be handsomer or dearer—but that she ever was "little." And then, when we begged her to sing! "Sing us one of the old songs you used to sing to mother, grandma."

"Children, I can't sing," she always said; and mother used to lay her knitting softly down, and the kitten stopped playing with the yarn upon the floor, and the clocked ticked lower in the corner, and the fire died down to a glow, like an old heart that is neither chilled nor dead, and grandmother sang. To be sure, it wouldn't do for the parlour and the concert room now-a-days; but then it was the old kitchen, and the old-fashioned grandmother, and the old ballad, in the dear old times, and we can hardly see to write for the memory of them, though it is a hand's breadth to the sunset.

Well, she sang. Her voice was feeble and wavering, like a fountain just ready to fail, but then how sweet-toned it was; and it became deeper and stronger; but it couldn't grow sweeter. What "joy of grief" it was to sit there around the fire, all of us, except Jane, that clasped a prayer to her bosom, and her thoughts we saw, when the hall-door was opened a moment by the wind; but then we were not afraid, for wasn't it her old smile she wore?—to sit there around the fire, and weep over the woes of the "Babes in the Woods;" who lay side by side in the great solemn shadows; and how strangely glad we felt when the robin-redbreast covered them with leaves, and last of all when the angels took them out of the night into day everlasting.

We may think what we will of it now, but the song and the story, heard around the kitchen fire, have coloured the thoughts and lives of most of us; have given us the germs of whatever poetry blessed our hearts; whatever memory blooms in our yesterdays. Attribute whatever we may to the school, and the schoolmaster, the rays which make that little day we call life, radiate from the God-swept circle of the hearthstone.

Then she sings an old lullaby she sang to mother—*her* mother sang to her; but she does not sing it through, and falters ere 'tis done. She rests her head upon her hands, and it is silent in the old kitchen. Something glitters down between her fingers and the firelight, and it looks like rain in the soft sunshine. The old grandmother is thinking when she first heard the song, and of the voice that sang it; when a light-haired, light-hearted girl, she hung around that mother's chair, nor saw the shadows of the years to come. Oh! the days that are no more! What spell can we weave to bring them back again? What words can we unsay, what deeds undo, to set back, just this once, the ancient clock of time?

So all our little hands were forever clinging to her garments, and staying here as if from dying, for long ago she had done living for herself, and lived alone in us. But the old kitchen wants a presence to-day, and the rush-bottomed chair is tenantless.

How she used to welcome us when we were grown, and came back once more to the homestead.

We thought we were men and women, but we were children there. The old-fashioned grandmother was blind in the eyes, but she saw with her heart, as she always did. We threw our long shadows through the open door, and she felt them as they fell over her form, and she looked dimly up and saw tall shapes in the door-way, and she says, "Edward I know, and Lucy's voice I can hear, but whose is that other. It must be Jane's"—for she had almost forgotten the folded hands. "Oh, no, not Jane, for she—let me see—she is waiting for me, isn't she?" and the old grandmother wandered and wept.

"It is another daughter, grandmother, that Edward has brought," says some one, "for your blessing."

"Has she blue eyes, my son?" Put her hand in mine, for she is my latest born, the child of my old age. Shall I sing you a song, children? Her hand is in her pocket as of old; she is idly fumbling for a toy, a welcome gift to the children that have come again.

One of us, men as we thought we were, is weeping; she hears the half-suppressed sob; she says, as she extends her feeble hand, "Here, my poor child, rest upon grandmother's shoulder; she will protect you from all harm. Come, children, sit around the fire again. Shall I sing you a song, or tell you a story? Stir the fire, for it is cold; the nights are growing colder."

The clock in the corner struck nine, the bed-time of those old days. The song of life was indeed sung, the story told, it was bedtime at last. Good night to thee, grandmother. The old fashioned grandmother was no more, and we miss her forever. But we will set up a tablet in the midst of the memory, in the midst of the heart, and write on it only this:

SACRED TO THE MEMORY
OF THE
OLD FASHIONED GRANDMOTHER.
GOD BLESS HER FOREVER.

A REVOLUTIONIST'S POLITICAL WILL.

THE following is a copy of a document found at Genoa among the papers of the late Colonel Pisacane, the chief of the last insurrection in Calabria. It is endorsed—"This is my political will," and is dated Genoa, June 24, 1857:

"At the moment that I am about to risk my life in a rash undertaking, I wish to make known my opinions to the country, in order to combat the criticisms of the vulgar, ever disposed to applaud the victors and to execrate the vanquished. My political opinions are sufficiently known—I believe in socialism, but in a different socialism from the French systems, all more or less founded on the monarchical and despotic idea which prevails in the nation. The socialism to which I allude may be comprised in the two words 'liberty' and 'association.' I have developed this opinion in two volumes which I composed—the fruit of nearly six years' study, and to which, for want of time, I have not been able to give the last touch, as regards style and diction. If some one of my friends would replace me and publish these two volumes, I would be extremely grateful to him. I am convinced that railways, electric telegraphs, machinery, improvements in manufactures—in fact, all that developes and facilitates commerce, is destined by an inevitable law to impoverish the mass of the people until a division of the profits is made by competition. All these means increase production, but they accumulate them in a small number of hands, from which it results that this so much-vaunted progress is, in fact, only decadence. If these pretended ameliorations are regarded as a progress it will be in this sense—that by increasing the misery of the people they will infallibly impel them to a terrible revolution, which, by changing social order, will turn to the advantage of all that which now serves for the profit of a few. I am convinced that Italy will become great by liberty, or will be a slave. I am convinced that temperate remedies such as the constitutional system in Piedmont and the progressive improvements granted to Lombardy, far from advancing the regeneration of Italy, can only retard it. As for myself, I would not make the smallest sacrifice to change a ministry or to obtain a constitution—not even to drive the Austrians out of Lombardy and to unite that province to the kingdom of Sardinia. In my opinion the domination of the house of Savoy and the domination of the house of Austria are precisely the same thing. I believe likewise that the constitutional system in Piedmont is more injurious to Italy than the tyranny of Ferdinand II. I believe firmly that if Piedmont had been governed in the same manner as the other States of Italy, the revolution of Italy would have been effected at the present day. This, my decided opinion, arises from the profound conviction I entertain that the propagation of an idea is a chimera—that the instruction of a people is an absurdity. Ideas are derived from facts and not facts from ideas, and a nation will not be free because it is educated, but it will very soon become educated when it shall be free. The only act a citizen can perform in order to be useful to his country is to wait patiently for an opportunity to coöperate in a material revolution. Conspiracies, plots, attempts at insurrection are, in my opinion, the series of facts through which Italy is moving towards her object—unity. The intervention of bayonets in Milan produced a much more efficacious propaganda than a thousand volumes written by the Doctrinaires, who are the real plague of our country and of the entire world. There are persons who say the revolution ought to be made by the country. That is incontestable, but the country is composed of individuals, and if all of us waited peaceably for the day of the revolution without preparing it by a conspiracy, the revolution would never break out. If, on the contrary, every body said, 'The revolution ought to be made by the country, and as I am an infinitesimal part of the country, I have myself an infinitesimal part of duty to fulfil, and if I fulfil it the revolution will be immediately accomplished,' it will be invincible, because it will be immense. One may not be agreed on the form of a conspiracy, on the place and time when a conspiracy ought to be accomplished; but not to be agreed on the principle is an absurdity, an act of hypocrisy, and a manner of concealing the basest egotism. I esteem the man who approves a conspiracy but does not conspire himself, but I despise those who not only will not act but who find pleasure in blaming and in execrating those who do act. With my principles I would have thought I had omitted a sacred duty if, seeing the possibility of attempting a surprise on a well-chosen point and under favourable circumstances, I had not employed all my energy in executing it, and in bringing it to a successful conclusion. I do not pretend to be the saviour of my country, though many idlers, for their own justification, have accused me of so pretending No; but I am convinced that a moral insurrection exists in the south of Italy, that an energetic impulse might drive the population to attempt a decisive movement, and it is for that reason my efforts are employed to accomplish a conspiracy which will give this impulse. If I arrive at the place of landing, which will be Sapri, I will consider I have gained a great personal success, should I afterwards die on the scaffold. A simple individual though I am, supported by a great number of generous men, I can do more, and if I do so the rest will depend on the country, and not on me. I have only my life to sacrifice for such an object, and I hesitate not to do it. I am convinced that if the enterprise succeed, I shall obtain universal applause. If I fail, the public will blame me. I shall be called silly, ambitious, turbulent; and those who, never acting themselves, pass their lives in criticising others, will minutely examine the enterprise, will expose my errors, and will accuse me of having failed through want of intellect, courage and energy. Let those detractors know that I consider them not only incapable of doing what I have attempted, but even of conceiving the idea of it. To those who will say that the enterprise was impossible I will reply that if it were necessary to obtain the approbation of the world previous to the undertaking of similar enterprises they should be altogether renounced. The world never approves beforehand any but vulgar plans. The man was called mad who first tried a steamboat in America, and the impossibility was subsequently demonstrated by crossing the Atlantic with such boats. Our Columbus was a madman before he discovered America, and the vulgar would have called Hannibal and Napoleon madmen had they succumbed, the one at Trebia, and the other at Marengo. I do not pretend to compare my undertaking with that of those great men. It resembles theirs, however, in one point of view, for it will be the object of universal disapprobation if I fail, and of the admiration of the world if I succeed. If Napoleon, before he quitted Elba to land at Frejus with fifty Grenadiers, had asked advice, his plan would have been unanimously blamed. Napoleon had what I have not, the prestige of his name; but I rally round my flag all the affections and all the hopes of the Italian revolutionists. All the griefs and all the miseries of Italy will fight on my side. I have but one word more to say. If I do not succeed I profoundly despise the ignoble vulgar who will condemn me. If I succeed I will very little appreciate their applause. I will find my reward in my conscience, and in the approbation of those dear and generous friends who afforded me their assistance, and who participated in the beating of my heart and in my hopes. Should our sacrifice produce no advantage to Italy, it will nevertheless be a glory for her to have produced children who desire to sacrifice themselves for her future prosperity.

"CHARLES PISACANE."

MEANING OF ANGLO-SAXON.

MAY I, at the beginning of this new year, which is to inaugurate also a new era of brotherhood between the United States and England, take the liberty of asking a question on a subject which has often puzzled me? It is probable that some one of your readers on the other side of the Atlantic may be able to explain my difficulty; for I believe the Americans were the first to use the name which I cannot understand, in the sense which seems to be gaining ground. My question is, "What do they, and their English imitators, mean by *Anglo-Saxon?*" What did the United States Consul mean, when, at the dinner lately given to Captain Hartstein, after substituting Turks and Russians for Dr. Watts' dogs and bears and lions, in the well-known little gnomic poem about "barking and biting," he continued,

> "But *Anglo-Saxons* should never let
> Such angry passions rise;
> Their great big hands were never made
> To tear each other's eyes!"

I am entirely at a loss to understand this name; and I wish some one would do me the favour to explain what is really meant by it. I know something of a people who were called by it, a good many centuries ago; who founded, in short, by slow degrees, a very powerful state in the largest part of the British Islands; and who, under the general name of Anglo-Saxons, continued to exist in England and Scotland for seven or eight hundred years. I have, indeed, given myself unusual pains to master their now extinct language, to recover much of their lost history and law, and to make the forms of their civilization intelligible to the people who now occupy the country which they occupied. But I have done this solely because these had become unintelligible; because towards the end of the eleventh century that peculiar civilization received a shock, which gave it a totally different direction, and so modified the whole being of the people, as to cause a system of entirely new combinations. From that time there have been assuredly no (or very few) *Anglo-Saxons* left in England, and I presume still fewer in the United States of America. There have been *Englishmen*, deriving their blood from Celts, Saxons, Norsemen, Frenchmen, Flemings, with a little admixture perhaps of the Old Roman. And these Englishmen, I believe, went to America, where they probably varied the stock a little more by some admixture of Dutch, and even Spanish blood, and by a very plentiful admixture of Welsh, Irish, Scotch, and Germau—both North and South. How all this can be Anglo-Saxon entirely passes my comprehension.

Still less, I presume, can it be meant to imply that the social and political institutions of the United States and Great Britain are Anglo-Saxon. This they most assuredly are not. The Anglo-Saxons certainly had serfs, and the Americans have the "domestic institutions," but the English have not; so that even here the parallel escapes me. American writers have already enriched our language with a number of expressions, which I regret not to be able to look upon as improvements. These have been excused on the ground that they are convenient representatives of novel ideas; but I believe that there was not the least necessity for their introduction among us. But it seems to me that this word *Anglo-Saxon*, if it means anything, means what is historically false, and should therefore be scouted by all true men. I believe, in fact, that it arises entirely from Mr. Thierry's dualistic theory, which arose entirely (by his own admission) from Sir Walter Scott's novel of *Ivanhoe*. I believe it is intended to imply that the *people* in England are Anglo-Saxon, but the *nobles* are not Anglo-Saxon, which is historically false: the nobility in England are just what the people are. And if it is further intended to imply that the people in America, being like the people in England, Anglo-Saxon, have an interest apart from the interest of the nobility in England—not being Anglo-Saxon—then I say that it is politically, as well as historically, false, and should be doubly resisted by all true men. If the Americans recognise the fact that the English people, mixed as it is, and of which they are themselves a great and gallant offshoot, possesses noble qualities of self-government, indomitable energy, high principle, and ἀρίστον φύσει which makes them the lords of the human race, I shall gladly agree with them. But still I must object to calling the English or Anglo-American people, *Anglo-Saxon*. If the Americans read *Beówulf* or *Cædmon*, or the *Laws and Institutes*, or the *Codex Diplomaticus*, or the *Saxons in England*, they would learn that the Englishman of to-day has as little to do with Alfred's language, as he has to do with his legislation: that at the tongue we speak, and the institutions we live under, are not more like those of the Anglo-Saxons, than the personal appearance of the Anglo-American is like that of the full, fat, light-haired, blue-eyed Mercian, or the rattling "go-ahead" spirit of the States like the somewhat heavy conservatism of the Anglian kingdoms. I am very ready to admit all the greatness which the Anglo-Americans may be disposed to find in the *English* character; but I wish to remind them, as well as my own countrymen, that the Englishman only became great by ceasing to be an Anglo-Saxon.—*Notes and Queries.*

INTERESTING RELIC.

WE find in the last number of the Culpeper *Observer* the subjoined letter, addressed to General Washington by a citizen of Fauquier County, Va., in the year 1781:

ELK RUN, FAUQUIER COUNTY, Va.,
Jan. 20, 1781.

DEAR SIR: Gen. Arnold, with 1,800 men, is now encamped three miles west of this spot. They continue to exercise the most unheard of cruelty, indiscriminately, on men, women, and children, and wanton destruction of every kind of property. All eyes are turned to you for vengeance. It was only yesterday that Sallie Metcalf was shot from her horse by a British sentinel, while she was endeavouring to make her escape. She is the wife of Capt. Metcalf, with whom you are well acquainted. I will help you with twenty mounted men, most of them good marksmen; and, if no objection is made, they would prefer to be near you, and bring with them their own rifles, in the use of which they will prove effectual. The bearer, Jack Brown, 6 feet 6 in his stockings, though above the average, is not a very unfair sample of the remaining nineteen, who anxiously await your reply to this tender of their services, and hope you will accept the same in the manner they desire.

I would suggest that you retain Jack, and in his place send back Tim Weeden with your reply. For other information I refer you to Jack. I would trust my life in his keeping. With a high regard, your very humble servant, HORACE RANDALL.

General George Washington, Philadelphia.

A few weeks since, says the *Observer*, in repairing a mantel-piece at Mount Vernon, an old letter was found, of which the above is a true copy. It had fallen through a crevice, and made a lodgment where, without the knowledge of any one, it has remained undisturbed for more than seventy years. What is most remarkable in connection with this letter is that *the writer is still alive*, and still resides in Fauquier! On being shown the letter he recognised the same. It was read to him by James Jeffries. "Yes," said he, "I remember well. Sally Metcalf recovered from the shot, and with her husband afterwards moved out to Kentucky. Her son was afterwards Governor of Kentucky. They moved out with Col. Tom Marshall, in 1793. Col. Marshall was Colonel of the Virginia Artillery of the Third Regiment, and fought at the Battle of Brandywine. Capt. John Chilton was under him and killed in that battle. Lafayette had just been promoted; was then about 21, and was wounded at the same time. Col. Tom Marshall was the father of John, afterwards appointed Chief-Justice of the United States. He died about the year 1802 or 1803. We have seen his grave at Washington, Mason County, Ky., about five miles from Maysville." As Mr. Jeffries came to that portion of the letter in relation to Jack Brown, Randall was brought to tears. He exclaimed, "My God! poor Jack Brown; I was the cause of his death, just to gratify Tim Weeden's wife, who had not seen her husband for two years." Mr. Jeffries remarked, "You did it all for the best, in a good cause, and it should not disturb you; it shows the goodness of your heart." "Yes," said he, "those are precisely the words of General Washington to me about 18 months afterwards."

Randall has never received a pension for his services, of which he always speaks in a light manner. If not entitled to one, he at least deserves the gratitude of his countrymen. The original letter may be seen at the office of the County Court of Fauquier.

DOUGLAS JERROLD'S WITTICISMS.

JERROLD'S wittieisms were generally made on the prompting of the occasion, and surprised every one by the quickness with which they were conceived and uttered. What made their freedom from premeditation the more certain, they very often consisted of some clause of a sentence—perhaps of but a single word—which only was sense as taken in connection with what some other person had just said. Jerrold, who was a little, spare man, with an oval, pallid face, a keen, gray eye, and resolute mouth, usually sat somewhat aside from what might be called the current of conversation, and only opened his mouth when he could cap something with a *bon mot*. It is universally acknowledged that such good things, when put in print, fall greatly short of the impression they made when first uttered by their author; nevertheless, the few which here follow, taken down some years ago, will perhaps give a faint idea of the style of the man:

At a dinner of a society connected with the fine arts, where a queen's counsel happened to be present, the Law was unexpectedly toasted, out of compliment to him. The learned gentleman blundered out a few sentences, stating that he did not see how the law could be considered as one of the *arts*. "*Black!*" rapped out Jerrold, like a dart from a bow.

On a literary friend producing a volume of miscellanies under the title of *Prose and Verse*, Jerrold bantered him about it, as "Prose and *Worse*."

A tedious old gentleman, meeting Jerrold in Regent street, and having stopped him, posed himself into button-holding attitude, while preparing to grapple. "Well, Jerrold, my dear boy, what is going on?" "I am," quoth the wit, instantly shooting off along the pavement.

A dull foreigner was indulging in a rapturous description of the beauties of the *Prodigue*. "As to one song in particular (*naming the song*), I was quite carried away." "Is there anybody here that can sing it?" said Jerrold.

Somebody told Jerrold that George Robins, the auctioneer, was dead; "and, of course," added the gentleman, "his business will go to the devil." "Oh, then, he'll get it again," said the wit.

A literary friend, who had set up a neat barouche with a pair of grays, drove Jerrold out one day into the country. As they passed through a village, the people came to their doors to behold the pretty equipage. "I think they're struck with our grays," remarked the charioteer. "I wonder what they would say of our duns!" quoth Jerrold.

He had a theory in the spirit of the *Caudle Lectures*, that women rather liked that their husbands should stay out late occasionally—"it gives them a *wrong*."

A DROVE OF IRISH BULLS.

THE following was written half a century ago by Sir Boyle Roche, a member of the Irish Parliament. The letter was addressed to a friend in London, and it is old enough to be new to nine out of ten readers:

"MY DEAR SIR: Having now a little peace and quietness, I sit down and inform you of the dreadful bustle and confusion we are all in from those blood-thirsty rebels, most of whom are, thank God, killed and dispersed. We are in a pretty mess; can get nothing to eat, nor any wine to drink, except whiskey; and when we sit down to dinner we are obliged to keep both hands armed. While I write this I hold a sword in each hand and a pistol in the other.

"I concluded from the beginning that this would be the end of it, and I see I was right; for it is not half over yet. At present there are such goings on that everything is at a stand still. I should have answered your letter a fortnight ago, but I did not receive it until this morning. Indeed, scarce a mail arrives without being robbed. No longer ago than yesterday the coach with the mail from Dublin was robbed near this town. The bags had been left behind for fear of accident, and by good luck there was nobody in it but two outside passengers, who had nothing for the thieves to take. Last Tuesday notice was given that a gang of rebels was advancing here under the French standard, but they had no colours nor any drums except bagpipes.

"Immediately every man in the place, including men, women and children, ran out to meet them. We soon found our force much too little; we were too near to think of retreating. Death was in every face; but at it we went, and began to be all alive again. Fortunately the rebels had no guns but pistols and pikes, and as we had plenty of muskets and ammunition, we put them all to the sword. Not a soul of them escaped, except some that were drowned in the adjacent bogs, and in a very short time nothing was heard but silence. Their uniforms were all different colours, but mostly green. After the action we went to rummage a sort of camp which they had left behind them. All we found was a few pikes without heads, a parcel of empty bottles of water, and a bundle of French commissions filled with Irish names. Troops are now stationed all around the country, which exactly squares with my ideas. I have only time to add that I am in a great hurry.

"P. S. If you do not receive this, of course it must have miscarried, therefore I beg you will write and let me know."

THE LATE MR. DOUGLAS JERROLD.

I FEEL it due to the memory of my father that the readers of this journal, at any rate, should not misunderstand the position in which he left his family. Fifty rumours, one and all erroneous, have been circulated on this private subject—become a public one, by the false light such rumours have cast upon my father's character. My father left property sworn at Doctors' Commons at £1,500. In addition to this sum, my mother held a policy in her own right, on my father's life, value £1,000; other items raise the total sum to £3,000. The copyrights of my father's plays realize an average income of £100. More, the position of the members of my father's family would have enabled them, had there been need for their exertions, to supply any deficiency the above property could not cover. It is due to the memory of my father that the public should know that he left a sufficiency for my mother and sister; and that the love of his own kindred, in any case, would have ensured this sufficiency.

In explanation of the "Remembrance" performances I, as representative of my father's family, should state that I declined emphatically to receive anything that should wear the appearance of a charity—such charity being needless. The "Remembrance" performances I was distinctly assured would be in honour of my father's memory, and be offered as an addition to his estate. If the public have gathered any idea, from the conduct of these performances, that they were efforts of charity, I have only to assure them, on the part of Mr. Douglas Jerrold's family, that the illustrious dead had husbanded sufficiently against the need thereof—even after the loss of thousands, for which, in the chivalry of friendship, he became security.

I thank the earnest friends who have conducted these performances, for their zeal and kind intentions; but I decline to permit the English public to remain impressed with the idea that there was need to pass the hat round—however gracefully—in the name of Douglas Jerrold: a name that shall not want my exertion, at least, to preserve its independenee. BLANCHARD JERROLD.

—Lloyd's Weekly Newspaper.

SURNAMES.—Mr. Bowditch, in his novel and interesting book on surnames, remarks, "The Bible informs us that man originally gave to the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air their names. The debt has certainly been repaid in these later times; *they have given to man all their names back again.*" Among the names of animals most common, are those of Lion, Bear, Camel, Wolf, Deer, Bruin, Doe, Colt, Lamb, Oxx, Badger, Hogg, Mink, Steer, Stag, Bullock, Fox, Buck, Coon, Mole, Hare, Hinds, Pusey, Beaver, Bull, Griffin. From a similar derivation, doubtless, are the names of Flock, Heard, Keine, Dobbin, Hinde, De Wolf, Prey, Lambkin, Oxenbridge, Hind, Metcalf, Coney, Bullard, Warren, Burroughs.

Families of Tiger, Stallion, Steed, Mare, Cow, Kid, Mutton, Pointer, Poodle, Pupp, Rabbit, Rat, Mouse, Ram, Otter and Heifer are found in England. Some of our fellow-citizens bear the name of Marrow, Kidney, Horn, Sides, Joint, Hide, Scales, Talon, Haslett, Withers, Gall, Gills, Crease, Tripe, Forepaugh, Hoofman and Wool.

Birds and fowls are represented, remarks Mr. Bowditch, in the different branches of Robin, Robbins, Gannett, Quail, Finch, Bullfinch, Canary, Dawes, Crane, Grouse, Chicken, Chickey, Blackbird, Patridge, Parrot, Duck, Drake, Curlew, Bunting, Coote, Pigeon, Dove, Wren, Peep, Teal, Hawks, Sparhawk, Sparrow, Buzzard, Pecker, Martin, Swallow, Crowe, Rook, Nightingale, Herron, Capron, Jay. Besides the family of "Birds," we have also Henville, Henny, Hatchman, Hatch, Birdseye, Coop and Mandrake, but not a person by the name of Eagle.

Turning to the department of fishes we have the names of Fish, Fisher, Fishly, Bedfish, Sholes, Eels, Salmon, Hake, Bass, Pike, Rotch, Place, Herring, Mullett, Lamprey, Pollock, Haddock, Sprat, Shad and Seal. Besides these we have Wier, Hook, Bate, Bateman, Skimmer, Codman, Finny, Cockle. Shell, Shelley and Crabbe.

Insects are represented by Messrs. Bease, Beeman, Sluggett, Bebee, Weatherbee, Fly, Cricket, Bugbee, Somerbee, Fleeman, Flea and Grubb.

A WIFE'S RETORT.—A clergyman being recently in company where several ladies were present, his wife amoug the number, and the recent crimes of Mrs. Cunningham becoming the subject of conversation, remarked, with a sort of rougish leer, that when a woman fell she was far worse in her conduct than one of the other sex. My dear husband, replied his wife, you will recollect that the height from which she falls is infinitely greater.—*Cambridge Chronicle.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

HOLLAND—ABOLITION OF SLAVERY.—The Government of Holland are about to present to the States-General a Bill for the abolition of slavery in the West Indies—that is, in the Antilles and Dutch Guiana. The slaveholders are to receive an indemnity, and the expense is estimated at rather more than £2,720,000.

——The *North British Review*, which was suspended for some months on account of the heterodox tendencies of some of its recent articles, has now reappeared. Kingsley and the Broad church men are excluded from its columns, and the original prospectus of 1848 is now reprinted as an indication of the future character of the Review.

——"The audited accounts show that the various performances, readings, and lectures have realized, after the payment of all expenses, a clear profit of £2,000. This sum is to be expended in the purchase (through trustees) of a Government annuity for Mrs. Jerrold and her unmarried daughter, with remainder to the survivor.

—— A JESUIT PUNISHED FOR FRAUD.—A curious trial lately took place in Florence. An agent of the Jesuits, named Prandeschi, was brought to trial for abstracting the property of a dying man named Soldi, and pleaded, in defence, that he was only obeying the instructions of his superiors, who would employ the money in masses for Soldi's soul. The Court, however, condemned him to solitary imprisonment for a term of years, and, though great exertions have been made to obtain his release, the sentence has been confirmed, and will be carried out.

——Professor Rogers, of the United States, who has been for some time in this country engaged in preparing for publication his work on the geology and physical geography of North America, is a candidate for the Chair of Natural History in the University of Glasgow, vacant by the death of Professor Couper. The Chair is in the gift of the Crown, and if no candidate of greater eminence should come forward, it will be the general feeling of naturalists that the goverament would do a graceful act, as well as serve the best interests of the Glasgow College, by appointing the distinguished American geologist to the Professorship. In the United States great liberality is shown in such appointments, of which we need only mention the name of Professor Agassiz as an instance.—*Literary Gazette.*

—— The first lottery in England upon record was brought forward in 1567 by the Queen's authority. In the proposals it was called "a rich lotterie general without any blanks, the prizes being in money, plate and various kinds of merchandise." The highest prize was £5,000—consisting of £3,000 in money, £700 in plate, "gilt and white," and the rest in "good tapestry and linen cloth." The second prize was £3 500, in about the same proportion. Then succeeded 29,998 other prizes, gradually reducing in value from £2,000 to 14s.; then followed 370,000 prizes of 2s. 6d. each. The tickets, 400,000, were sold at 10s. each, raised £200,000; whilst the whole amount of prizes and estimated charges amounted to £100,000, thus leaving a balance of £100,000 for the government—a very large amount at that time, which was to be spent "in the restoration of havens, and strengthening of the realm, and toward such good public works."

——A PROFITABLE SPECULATION.—Of the same school was also the late Lord Cholmondeley, always a great friend of George IV., who raised him to the marquisate. He was a great frequenter of French society before the revolution. He was one of the four who set up that celebrated faro bank, at Brookes's, which ruined half the town. They would not trust the waiters to be croupiers, but themselves dealt the cards alternately, being paid three guineas an hour out of the joint fund, and at this rate Lord C—— and other noblemen of the highest rank were seen slaving like menials till a late hour in the morning. Their gains were enormous, as Mr. Thompson, of Grosvenor-square, and Lord Cholmondeley realized each between £300,000 and £400,000. Tom Stepney had a share, but would always punt against his own partners, and lost on one side what he gained on the other. A Mr. Paul, who brought home a large fortune from India, lost £90,000 in one night, was ruined, and went back to the East to make another.—*A Portion of the Journal kept by T. Raikes, Esq.*

——YANKEE'S CRITICISM.—We were once on our way to Florence; our companion was the friend of many a day afoot. Learned as a pundit, enthusiastic as a boy, nature, antiquity, art, were old familiars to him; yet, so eager was he to greet any novelty which they offered, that he loved to anticipate it by thought and talk, like a child when he awakes at dawn to dream over the coming holiday, or when he goes forth on the stairs to inhale the savour of the goose he is afterwards to feast on, or site before the drop-curtain of his first play. At the place where we were stopping, was a Yankee, who had just come from Florence the beautiful. Our friend approached him warily, and began to ask him what he had seen, what admired. Then, after a little circumlocution, he dashed at once, *in medias res*, by saying, "Of course you were in raptures with the Venus de Medici?" expecting an answer such as he would himself have given. "Well, sir, to tell you the truth, I don't care much about those stone gals," was the reply he received. Our friend collapsed—*Blackwood's Magazine.*

——SLEEPLESS NIGHTS IN INDIA.—During the night, in the month of May, it is impossible to sleep with closed windows, and nearly as impossible to do so with open ones. Thus, sleep is almost hopeless. The beasts, the birds, the insects, the reptiles, appear to join in one universal tumult, and even human beings seem to take very little repose. In a temple not far off a priest is beating a drum, and, I conclude, invoking the help of some god or goddess. When the drumming ceases I sink into a doze, but to be again roused by howling jackals, tearing over the flats in pursuit of prey, by the hooting of the "night-hawk" (as it is called here, though it is, in fact, a screech owl), then by the deep-toned note of an enormous frog, mingled with the "chip, chip," of many a grasshopper, and about day-light a lively bird, anxious to be "up and doing," begins a merry chirp, or a crow with his vulgar "caw, caw," destroys all hopes of rest. At last, as day dawns, I see, outside the bed, those little greedy mosquitoes clinging to the